

THE
CHRISTIAN
REMEMBRANCER.

No. 42.]

JUNE, 1822.

[VOL. IV.]

RELIGION AND MORALS.

SERMON ON CHARITY.

1 Cor. xiii. 13.

And now abideth faith, hope, Charity.—
these three—but the greatest of these
is Charity.

WERE we required to express in one word the effects of our most holy Religion, that word would surely be Charity; not as it is too commonly understood in the limited acceptance of alms-giving or acts of positive beneficence, but as it comprehends all those kindly and benevolent affections, in whatever way they may shew themselves, which constitute within us the principle of Love. For it may be worthy of remark, that wherever, in our translation of the New Testament, we meet with the words Charity or Love, the original is the same in both cases, and the two words are to be considered as equivalent, and are used indiscriminately for each other.

An early mention of this benevolent principle occurs in one of our Lord's last discourses with his disciples, wherein he makes it the distinguishing badge of a Christian's profession.

"By this, says HE, shall all men know that ye are my disciples; if ye have love one to another; and a new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another."

It shone forth with peculiar lustre in the conduct of the early Chris-

tians, as we may learn from that lovely and interesting picture, which has been left of them by the pen of their inspired historian.

"They continued stedfastly in the the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread,"—(an expression considered to be equivalent to their receiving of the Lord's Supper)—"and in prayer; and all that believed were together, and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need."

It is thus magnified by the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Romans.

"Owe no man any thing but to love one another,"—i. e. let this be your chief consideration, the main duty that you have to perform, to love your fellow-creatures; "for he that loveth another, hath fulfilled the law. For this, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not covet: and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour; therefore" resuming his former assertion, he concludes, "Love is the fulfilling of the law."

The same language is used, the same exhortation given to the other Churches.

The Galatians are reminded, that

"in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith, which worketh by love."

The Ephesians are exhorted to "walk worthy of their vocation, wherewith they were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another *in love*."

To the Philippians he writes, "If there be any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, fulfil ye my joy, that ye be like minded, having the same *love*, being of one accord, of one mind."

For his Colossian, and the same for his Thessalonian converts he offers up his hearty prayers, and thanksgivings, for that he had "heard of their faith in Christ Jesus, and the love which they had to all the Saints."

To Timothy he repeats the declaration that he had before made to the Romans, "the end of the commandment is Charity—out of a pure heart, and a good conscience and faith unfeigned."

And in the rules that he sends to Titus for the government of the Cretan Church, he specifies Charity as an essential qualification of the aged:

"That the aged be sound in Charity."

St. Peter holds the same strain, and calls upon the Christians generally, to "love one another with a pure heart fervently,"—and "above all things," says he, "have fervent charity among yourselves"—adding thereunto this strong encouragement, "for charity shall cover the multitude of sins:"—shall, through the merits of your Redeemer, procure for you the forgiveness of your trespasses, as it has led you to overlook and forgive the trespasses, the personal injuries, that you may have received from your brethren.

From the Epistle of St. John it would be idle to extract the numerous passages that inculcate the duty of love. The whole of his first Epistle is almost one continued exhor-

tation to this effect; grounding our love of the brethren on nothing less, than "the love that God has manifested towards us."—An exalted source this! and, when duly considered, the highest possible encouragement that could be offered!

"Herein," says this aged Apostle, "is love"—love in its highest perfection; "not that we loved God;"—far otherwise—for we were in enmity with him through our sins, "but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." "Beloved,"—it is in this affectionate manner that he addresses his Christian brethren; that in the very act of admonishing, he might be an example of what he taught—"Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."

Interesting, however, as this Epistle is, (and possibly on none of the sacred writings do we dwell with more delight than on those of this Apostle), and full on the subject of our present consideration, still must it yield to that more detailed account of the comparative excellence, and nature, and duration of Charity, which the Apostle Paul has given us in the chapter from which the text is taken.

The Apostle was writing to the Corinthian Church, who appear to have been favoured beyond every other, with a profusion of spiritual or miraculous gifts for the advancement of the Gospel.

"Ye come behind," saith he in the opening of his Epistle, "in no gift; in every thing ye are enriched by him in all utterance and in all knowledge." In the 12th chapter he specifies these several gifts. "To one is given by the Spirit, the word of wisdom,"—a full and accurate comprehension, through the immediate revelation of God, of the mysteries of the Gospel; "to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit"—knowledge of those antient prophecies and writings of the Old Testament, which may tend to the

conversion of the Jews; "to another faith,"—or a firm belief, and deep and accurate understanding of the general scheme of the Gospel, the result of a careful examination of its evidences, and a diligent attendance on the preaching of the Apostles; "to another the gift of healing;" "to another the working of miracles;" "to another prophecy"—in its largest sense, as it contains the ability to preach, as well as the prediction of future events; "to another discerning of spirits"—that is, of the thoughts and hearts of men, no less than of the truth of their pretensions to be inspired; "to another divers kinds of tongues with their interpretation."

And, answerably, as it would seem, to these, the Apostle goes on to enumerate the several officers which it had pleased the Almighty to place over his Church; "Apostles" endowed with the wisdom that was from above; "Prophets," duly informed in the full import of the sacred Scriptures, and ready to turn the weight of antient prophecy to convince their Jewish brethren; "Teachers" accurately taught themselves, and able to instruct others in the whole scheme of the Christian faith; "Miracles," or persons invested with the gift of working miracles; "Healers," corresponding to the gift of healing; "Helpers," or assistants in the ministry, to the gifts of prophecy; "Governments" to the discerning of spirits; and lastly, diversities of tongues," or persons miraculously impowered to speak or interpret different languages, as the necessities of the infant Church might require.

Under such signal marks then of the peculiar favour of God, what should have been the feelings of the Corinthians? None of these gifts were of their own procuring by any wit or study of theirs: they were altogether the free and unmerited communication of that "one and the self-same Spirit, who divided to every man severally, as he pleased."

The smallest was as undeserved and as much above the utmost stretch of human power as the greatest. No individual could reasonably boast over another; for he had nothing which he had not received, and the same hand that gave, might in a moment withdraw the gift. What then should have pervaded the Corinthian Church, when assembled in the full exercise of their several gifts, but one intense feeling of thankfulness to God, who had so honoured and blessed them; and of love towards one another, selected as they thus were, to work together for the advancement of one common end?

But the case was far otherwise. "It hath been declared unto me of you, saith the Apostle, that there are contentions among you." Dissatisfied with the gifts that had been severally bestowed on themselves, the individuals of this divided Church were envying the endowments one of another. What course then does the Apostle take to heal these unhappy differences?

"I admit,"—we may thus expand his argument,—“that the gifts differ in their value; that the best gifts are a laudable object of your pious ambition and earnest prayers; nay, I would say to you, ‘covet, desire earnestly ‘the best gifts;’ but yet ‘shew I unto you a more excellent way’ to obtain them, than you seem to be aware of; and what is in truth far better and more lasting than them all. You wish to be active ministers of the Gospel, and enriched with the most glorious of those miraculous gifts with which it has pleased the Almighty to assist the weakness of his infant Church. It is a praiseworthy desire: but in the indulgence of this desire have you not forgotten your distinguishing badge as Christians?”

"Though I speak," says this energetic Apostle—and he puts the case in his own person, that he might give the less offence,—“though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels,” though I possess the

miraculous power of speaking every language on earth, and even the language of the angels in heaven, "and" yet, forgetting my private duty as a Christian, "have not Charity;"—the love of God and man working within me, "I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal," giving out as these do, a sound under the agency of a higher power, but myself the meanwhile as unanimated in a spiritual sense, as these material substances are in a natural.

And though I should be so pre-eminently inspired with the gift of "prophecy," as to "understand" clearly and fully "all" the "mysteries," that are hid under the law of Moses, "and all" the "knowledge" God has declared by the mouth of his Prophets from the beginning of the world even till now; and though from a diligent examination of the character of my-blessed Master, and the purity of his religion, and the amazing power of his miracles, and the exact fulfilment of every prophecy in his person, I "should have" arrived at the highest possible degree of "faith," so that in the strength of this faith I could perform the most difficult work, even (to use a proverbial expression) to the removal of mountains "and yet" with all this, "have no Charity, I am nothing:" I may be very useful as a preacher of the Gospel, but as a Christian myself with the conditional hope of heaven before mine eyes, "I am nothing"—of no worth whatever in the sight of God, and without any chance of attaining, through Christ, to the kingdom of heaven.

"And though" in the magnificence of my heart, or out of a love of the praise of men, or with a view to the advancement of my temporal interests, "I bestow all my goods to feed the poor," and in my tenacity to the opinions that I may have espoused, or out of a shame to retract, or a vain-glorious boast of continuing to the end, "I give my body to

be burned; and yet" am uninfluenced by the spirit of "Charity," the glory of my martyrdom, the abundance of my alms, the greatness of my faith, the extent of my knowledge, and the power of speaking with the tongues of men and angels, "will profit me nothing." And wherefore? Because in the pursuit of the means of advancing the cause of religion, I have, in my conduct, forgotten the substance of religion itself. For what is Charity but the substance? Look at its fruits, and acknowledge its great and comprehensive excellence.

Like forbearance, it "suffereth long," and avengeth not itself; but rather giveth place unto wrath, remembering the Scripture, "vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord."

Like mercy, it is "kind," and tender-hearted, forgiving as it hopes itself to be forgiven.

Like contentment, it "envieth not," but rejoiceth with them that do rejoice.

Like discretion, it "vaunteth not itself,"—is never over-bearing, but singularly cautious of inadvertently wounding the feelings or interests of its brethren.

Like humility, it "is not puffed up, or rendered wise in its own conceit."

Like modesty, it "behaveth not itself unseemly," but renders to all their dues; to its superiors respect, to men of low degree condescension and regard.

Like generosity, it "seeketh not its own" to the exclusion of the welfare of another; yea, rather shaping its conduct by that admonition of the Apostle, "in honour prefer one another."

Like meekness, it "is not easily provoked."

Like simplicity, it "thinketh no evil,"—Like godliness, it "rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth."—Like kindness, it "beareth," or rather covereth and keeps out of sight, (where duty requires

not the publication), the faults of its neighbours.

Like faith, it "believeth in the veracity of his protestations."

Like hope, it "hopeth" in the sincerity of his amendment, and

Like patience, it "endureth" all things, as well the injuries and provocations of man, as the wholesome chastisements of God. In a word, it is the crown, and sum, and principle of every other virtue, entering into and adorning, and sanctifying every other. It is like that "wisdom from above," of which an Apostle speaks—"first pure," as its source; "then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy, and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy."

And as its nature is thus excellent, and its operation comprehensive, so is its continuance lasting beyond every other gift. "Charity never faileth,"—but "whether there be prophecies, they shall fail," when the Church shall no longer require miraculous instruction; "whether there be tongues, these shall cease" when study shall have supplied their place; "whether there be knowledge" of the ultimate and spiritual intention of former dispensations, "it shall vanish away" before that blaze of evidence which shall shortly unfold to every eye the full mystery of the Gospel. For what is the knowledge, of which you boast, but as a single ray to enlighten the faithful? And what is this prophesying but a channel after all of partial instruction? "We know" but "in part, and prophesy in part;" but when that, which is perfect, is come, and the Gospel shall have been fully established by the aid of these miraculous helps, "then that which is in part shall be done away." "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things." And the same process shall be observable in the ages of the Church. In its present infancy, when its doc-

trines are unknown, and their effects untried, and the obstacles to be encountered great and appalling, these miraculous gifts are suited to its exigencies; but in its maturer years, they shall be put away.

And if this shall be their fate in this world, how much more in that higher and more perfect state which awaits the Christian in the heavens? Where will then be the need of your gift of healing, when God shall have wiped away the tear from every eye, and death and sorrow, and crying and pain shall be no more? Where your opportunity of working miracles, when this world with all its objects shall have passed away? Where your knowledge of tongues, when saints and angels, with one heart and one voice, shall sing the song of the Lamb? Where your privilege of unfolding mysteries and interpreting prophecies, when every prophecy shall have been accomplished, and every mystery unfolded? "Now, indeed, we see as through a glass darkly," enveloped, as we are, with the veil of this weak and corrupted flesh; "but then face to face"—fully and clearly—"now" at the best, "we know but in part," however rich or extensive our endowments may be, "but then shall we know, even as we are known."

Amid this evanescence, however, of every other gift, shall Love be equally transient? Is this but the ornament of the Church in her infancy, and to be laid aside in her maturer years? "Now"—through every period of her existence "abideth Charity," grounded on "faith," and encouraged by "hope." These three the Church can never lay aside, without ceasing to be the body of Christ; these three must be the constant attendants on her earthly pilgrimage. And yet among these "the greatest is Charity;" for in its effects it is more beneficial; in its nature more allied to the divine image—for 'God,' saith the Apostle, 'is Love'—and in its duration eternal.

Faith and hope benefit indeed the individual possessors of these graces, but Charity benefits others; faith and hope rest on God; Charity would imitate him. The time shall come, when faith shall be lost in sight; for we shall behold our Lord as He is; and hope swallowed up in enjoyment, for we shall be in heaven; but love shall then become more lovely, for we shall be in the presence of the Beloved—of Him, who is the God of Love, and who has loved us with an everlasting love, and we shall be ourselves knit together, with angels and archangels, in one indissoluble and everlasting bond.

I have thus endeavoured, by a careful induction of particular passages out of the discourses of our blessed Lord, and the writings of his Apostles, to establish and enforce the peculiar importance attached, in the Holy Scriptures to the gift of Charity, "the very bond of peace" (to adopt the language of

our excellent Liturgy) "and of all virtue, without which, whosoever liveth, is counted dead before God." Neglect not then, I beseech you, as you value your everlasting salvation, to cherish this sacred principle within your breasts; banish, by God's grace, every rancorous, and revengeful, and selfish feeling—and "put on, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies" towards the poor—"kindness" towards all men,—"*humbleness of mind*,"—"meekness" under every provocation,—"*long-suffering*" however offended; "*forbearing one another, and forgiving one another*" "if any man have a quarrel against any; even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye."

"And above all things put on Charity, which is the bond of perfectness; and let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body in Christ Jesus our Lord."

C.

SCRIPTURE CRITICISM.

To the Editor of the Remembrancer.

Sir,

You will probably think, that it is a refined and fastidious scruple, which I have often felt in reading the allusion to the case of Judas in the first exhortation in the Communion Office. I am free to own that it is an objection, with which I am not aware that others have been perplexed, and which I should therefore have concealed within my own bosom, if I was not persuaded after mature consideration, that it is capable of a satisfactory solution.

It is on the following words that my objection is grounded: "*Repent you of your sins or else come not to that holy table, lest after the taking of that holy Sacrament the Devil enter you as he entered into Judas,*

and fill you full of all iniquities and bring you to destruction both of body and soul."

It is the plain import of these words, that if a person comes to the Lord's table without the necessary preparation of repentance, his unworthy celebration will open a passage by which the Devil may enter into him, and fill him full of all iniquities, and bring him to destruction both of body and soul. It is a sentence of strong and earnest admonition on the great peril of the unworthy receiving of the Lord's Supper; but does the allusion to the case of Judas imply that *he* is an example of the sin and danger of such unworthy celebration, or that the Devil entered into him, because he partook of the bread and the wine at the last Supper, of which he was unworthy to partake?

The words in question before the last Revision, formed part of the third exhortation at the time of the celebration, but although their position is changed, their meaning was always the same, and they were always liable to the same objection.

Comber after many just observations on the discipline of the Church, and the necessity of exact and rigorous caution in warning and deterring impenitent offenders, adverts to the history of Judas and to the awful example which his history exhibits.

"We appeal to every man's conscience, and set before them the danger of coming with wicked purposes for so they imitate Judas, who notwithstanding that plain caution, Matt. xxvi. 24. set down with a heart full of treachery and covetousness; John xiii. 26, 27. but instead of being a partaker of Christ, Satan did enter into him and confirmed his wicked purposes, so that he came to destruction both of body and soul. Repent therefore O you profane wretches being warned by so terrible an example or else your judgment is inevitable; for if you continue in these damnable sins you die, and if you think to find favour by laying hold of Christ's body you are mistaken, for you profane the mystery, violate God's covenant, trample on the blood of Christ, to which you have no right, so long as you live in open defiance to his laws; and if you come thus, you give Satan more power over you, both to corrupt you and to ruin you; yet if you stay away you cannot escape unless you do repent; and if you would do that, after awhile you might be received: However we have delivered our souls by giving you this warning, do not cast away yours by despising it."

In this paraphrase the learned Commentator affirms, that Judas "sat down," as he unquestionably did to the feast of the Passover, and he insinuates that instead of

being a partaker of Christ, Satan did enter into him; but Satan entered into him before the institution of the Lord's Supper; and it is yet to be proved that Judas was present at that Supper, and that he could in any sense be a partaker of Christ, with reference to that Supper. Dr. Bennet, as he is quoted by Bishop Mant in his useful Annotations on the Common Prayer, proceeds with more caution, and leaving it uncertain whether Judas did partake of the Supper of the Lord, maintains that our Church does not compare Judas and the unworthy Communicant as Communicants, but in the effect produced upon the aggravated sinfulness of each. His words are:

"The Church does not here affirm, that the Devil entered into Judas after he had received the holy Eucharist, but only that he entered into Judas, whether he received the holy Eucharist or not: and she exhorts her members to take care, that their unworthy participation do not cause the Devil to enter into them. The circumstance of receiving therefore is no part of the comparison, for the comparison goes no further, than the entering in of the Devil."

This appears to be the true meaning of the Church, the order of whose words would otherwise have been, "lest the Devil enter into you as he entered into Judas, after receiving that holy Sacrament." As the exhortation is at present ended, the taking of the Sacrament is the peculiar offence of the unworthy Communicant; the entrance and energy of the Devil are alone common to him and to Judas.

This may be shewn to be the true order of the Evangelical History. Bishop Sandford in his "Lectures upon the history of the Week of the Passion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which at this season will engage and reward the attention of the Christian Scholar, thus arranges in correspondence with Dr.

Hales, the events which accompanied the treachery of Judas, and his conduct before the last Supper.

"Jesus checked the impetuosity of Peter by predicting that 'before the cock should crow twice he would deny him thrice.' But 'He who knew what was in man' had a heavier and more mournful lesson still to teach them how false may sometimes be the semblance of Enthusiasm. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, that *one of you* shall betray me,' were words to moderate the ardour of profession and to mortify the confidence of courage yet untried! They heard with deep dejection. 'Lord, is it I?' was the only question their anxious hearts suggested or their trembling lips could frame. 'And he answered and said unto them; he that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me.' Judas in his turn now asked, 'Master, is it I?'—'*Thou hast said,*' was the affirmative reply. But this was probably uttered in a low tone by Jesus, and not heard by the other disciples. Thus far I follow the account given by St. Matthew. St. John adds some further circumstances, in which his was the principal share. 'The disciples' he says, (probably not having heard the answer to Judas) 'looked on one another, doubting of whom he spoke.' Then Peter gave a sign to John, whose situation at the table, next to Jesus, gave him the opportunity of making the inquiry, to ask who was intended. Jesus answered in an under voice, 'He it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it.' It was the custom, at the second course, which they were now eating, for the master of the house to dip a piece of unleavened bread into the sallad of bitter herbs, and distribute to the guests. To Judas Iscariot was the sop delivered. And after the morsel Satan entered into him again, and took full possession of his heart. For finding that he was now detected by his master, and con-

ceiving himself marked out to the whole company by this significant act, rage and fear impelled him to put his premeditated treachery into immediate execution. So he rose from the table, as we may conjecture from our Lord's words to him, 'What thou doest, do quickly.' Thereupon he immediately went out, 'and it was night.' But none of the disciples knew why Jesus thus spake to him, and even John does not appear to have collected, that the act of which our Lord had given notice was to be immediate. Thus had the traitor full opportunity from the time at which he left the table, and the absence of all suspicion in his brethren, to concert his plan with the chief priests."

"Judas being departed our Lord proceeded to the third course of the Paschal feast; but here he laid aside the Jewish ritual and uncovering the bread, which as master of the family he had set apart beneath the napkin, he was pleased to institute the Sacrament, which was henceforth to supersede the typical and prefiguring observance, and by a commemorative representation to preserve the memory of his precious death till he come again." Lecture III.

This arrangement plainly agrees with the narratives of St. Matthew, and more especially of St. John, and sufficiently shews that Judas was not present at the institution and first celebration of the Lord's Supper, and that the Devil entered into him immediately *after* he had received the sop, and *before* our Lord proceeded to establish the memorial of his death. But can the absence of Iscariot be reconciled with the record of St. Luke, in whose Gospel our Lord is reported to have said, as in a continuous speech: "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you, but behold the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table." It is obvious to ask, how could the hand be present,

if the person were absent? For the resolution of this difficulty, it will be of importance to consider, in what sense St. John uses the word *immediately*, when he says that Judas ~~is~~ having received the sop went out immediately," and whether there is a necessary dependence and connexion in the words of St. Luke.

There can be no doubt; that the word *immediately*, may be used in a larger and a stricter sense; but in the present case if it is not used in the strict sense, it is altogether redundant. The short interval between the celebration of the Passover and the apprehension of our Lord, rendered it necessary, that Judas should quickly leave the table; St. John is very distinct in describing the time, saying, that he went out immediately, that when he went out it was night, and that when he was gone, Jesus used the remarkable words: "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in him." The words of St. John therefore I conceive must be strictly interpreted.

But is it lawful to separate the words of St. Luke, so as to make them harmonize with those of St. John, thus strictly interpreted. St. Luke is not remarkable for observing a precise and distinct order in his report either of discourses or of facts, of which his arrangement will be found to vary materially from those of the other Evangelists. In the present text, he does not himself connect the two sentences, which he delivers in succession, by the conjunction *and* or *but* (καί, ἔ, η, or ἀλλὰ) but by the adversative particle, *nevertheless* (παρὰ) which Schleusner translates *præterea*. Clarke in his paraphrase, separates the twentieth and twenty-first verses, introducing the latter as a new paragraph. Neither does St. Luke in the latter verse use any verb, indicative of time past, present, or future: for the verb *is* in the authorized translation, is an interpolation.

properly printed in the Italic character. St. Luke uses the interjection Behold; to attract attention to something wonderful, and extraordinary; and his words literally translated are: Nevertheless, (or furthermore) behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table. Now if it shall be conceded, that these words are not necessarily connected with those which precede them, it may also be admitted, that Iscariot was not present when the former words were delivered, i. e. at the first celebration of the Sacrament. If this connexion and dependence shall be insisted upon, then the ellipsis of the verb in the twenty-first verse may be supplied by a verb in the past tense. Behold that at such a time, when I am shedding my blood for you, the hand of the traitor should have been at the table with me. And truly the Son of Man goeth, as was determined, but woe unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed. In either case, it is not necessary to infer, that Judas was present at the institution of the Sacrament, or that he was a partaker of the mystical body and blood of Christ. In the more exact method of St. Matthew, the words of the twenty-first verse were delivered before the institution of the Supper: and the inquiry concerning the traitor, which in St. Luke immediately follows the delivery of these words, is in St. Matthew the occasion of introducing them. St. Luke's narrative will not therefore sustain the presence of Judas at the first Eucharist: nor can his presence be inferred from the words in which our Lord says in reference to the number of his Apostles, "Ye shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel," for it is far more plain, that Judas fell from that office, than that he was ever designed to fulfil it.

It is obvious to observe the critical exactness of our Church, in
U u

her cautious and general allusion to the case of Judas: He is represented not as an example of an unworthy communicant, but as an example of the aggravated guilt and danger, and punishment of unrepented sin: as an example which such as are unworthy to receive the Lord's Supper will improve, not by absence from the table which he never polluted because he never attended, but by avoiding in a spirit of sincere and earnest repentance those judicial complications of sin, which were the consequences of his impenitence and hardness of heart.

A. M.

To the Editor of the Remembrancer.

Sir,

I KNOW not whether the following remarks on an obscure text, Jude v. 9. will be thought worthy of insertion in your excellent Miscellany.

"Yet Michael the Archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, the Lord rebuke thee."

Here is an allusion to Zech. iii. 1, 2.

"And he shewed me Joshua the High-Priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto Satan, the Lord rebuke thee, O Satan: even the Lord, that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?"

The angel of the Lord, before whom Joshua stood, and the Lord, who spake unto Satan, are one and the same, namely, the Logos, the second person of the Trinity, mentioned Zech. i. 11. and it is well remarked by Lowth, that by the words, "the Lord rebuke thee," God the Father, the first person of the Trinity is indicated; so that the text is parallel with Gen. xix. 24. and proves, that a distinction of persons

in the blessed Trinity was a doctrine contained, although obscurely, in the Old Testament. But the learned Bishop Horsley has delivered it as his opinion, that by Michael the Archangel in Dan. x. 13. the Messiah himself is meant, in his "character of champion of his faithful people against the violence of the apostate faction and the wiles of the devil." "Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me," are the words in Daniel: Michael was superior to Gabriel, for he comes to help him in the greatest difficulties; "one of the chief Princes, or one of the capital Princes, or one of the Princes, that are the head of all; for this is the full, and not more than the full import of the Hebrew words. Now the princes, that are first, or at the head of all, are clearly no other than the three princes in the Godhead. Michael, therefore, is one of them, and which of them, there can be no doubt. In perfect consistence with this description of Michael in the book of Daniel is the action assigned to him in the Apocalypse, in which we find him fighting with the old Serpent, the deceiver of the world, and victorious in the combat. That combat who was to maintain? in that combat, who was to be victorious but the seed of the woman?" Such are the comments of Bishop Horsley. If then the passage in Jude be compared with Zech. iii. 1, 2. and Dan. x. 13. as illustrated by these eminent commentators, a very close parallelism between the Prophet Zechariah and the Apostle may be traced: and could we venture to suppose, that for "the body of Moses," St. Jude originally wrote the body of Joshua, the reference to Zech. iii. 1, 2. would be very precise.

But what interpretation is to be given to the words, "the body of Moses?" The interment of the Jewish lawgiver is mentioned, Deut. xxxiv. 6.

"And he (the Lord) buried him in a valley in the land of Moab over

against Beth-Peor: but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day."

From this passage compared with Jude v. 6. "we may collect," says the learned Dr. Hales, who concurs with Archbishop Tillotson and other divines, "that he was buried by the Ministry of Angels, near the scene of the idolatry of the Israelites; but that the spot was purposely concealed, lest his tomb might also be converted into an object of idolatrous worship among the Israelites, like the brazen serpent." It is very likely then, that St. Jude refers to some traditional report of a contest between Michael and Satan respecting the body of Moses, and that report may have been framed upon the passage in Zechariah already adverted to. The supposition is strengthened by the circumstance, that the Apostle quotes v. 14, the Apocryphal book of Enoch, some account of which is given in the first volume of the Christian Remembrancer. St. Paul also refers to some Jewish record, when he mentions Jannes and Jambres withstanding Moses, names not elsewhere mentioned in Holy Writ. 2 Tim. iii. 8. So curious have been the enquirers, who have exercised their ingenuity on this text of St. Jude, that there have not been wanting those who surmised, that the ground of the contest respecting the body of Moses was, that he had rendered himself unworthy of burial by excessive zeal and precipitance in the transaction recorded, Exod. ii. 11—15.

The words, "the body of Moses," may, however, be used metaphorically, and Dr. Hammond supposes, that they may refer to the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem, and the re-establishment of the Jewish religion and laws after the captivity; so that "the body of Moses" may signify the Mosaic institution in the same manner as "the body of Christ" is used for the Christian Church. 1 Cor. xii. 27. Eph. iv. 12.

I conclude with the the learned Toup's brief hint on a passage in Longinus, "ὅλοι τὸ σωματίον δραματικόν ὑπερῆσαντο. Hesychius, ἰδιῶς τὸ Ὁμήρου σωματίον. Atque huc nescio an referendus D. Judas in Epist. v. 9. Sed de hoc viderint Theologi. (Toup. Long. sect. 9.)

The passage is admitted on all hands to be obscure; the words are introduced by way of illustration in argument; they do not contain any point of doctrine, nor are they likely to be wrested by the perverters of sacred truth: it may, however, be desirable in your Miscellany to present to the Theological Student such explanations, as a comparison of texts and philological researches suggest.

I am, &c.

CLER. GLOC.

To the Editor of the Remembrancer.

SIR,

WHEN I first took up my pen to oppose the authenticity of the Heavenly Witnesses, I was perfectly aware of going to place myself in the situation of one, who, having once planted his foot on a nest of wasps, must either be prepared to crush the whole swarm, or instantly expect to be stung to the quick. This opening remark will apply in a high degree to the petulance and flippancy of your angry correspondent, who has become my second antagonist; and who, it seems, has the honour to subscribe himself, Fred. Nolan. But, though I can readily imagine Mr. Nolan to be both a scholar and a gentleman; it would be acting with great insincerity on my part, were I for a moment to admit, that I thought him competent either to establish the authenticity of the disputed verse, or to disprove any one of my principal positions; for as to the commission of a mistake, since I do not profess to be infallible, so I shall always be

most ready to retract an error, when once pointed out to me and sufficiently detected.

It had been my original wish, with whatever opponent I might be brought in contact, to argue the question in a mild and dispassionate manner; but Mr. Nolan, from the impotency of his temper, has left me no other alternative than to treat him as a peevish and virulent assailant; and to scourge him with that triple lash, which I cannot but see, was intended for my own back. In his first onset, I am directly charged with having stolen my display of learning from Griesbach; as being ignorant of the state of the Arian controversy; and as having obtruded myself into the present contest from no other motive than to make a shew of my reading. To these unmanly reflections I shall, for the present, reply, that in the existing stage of the controversy of the Heavenly Witnesses, I am very sure, I shall be easily pardoned by the learned reader for any statement which I may seem immediately to have taken from Griesbach; whilst my opponent, on the other hand, will be as severely censured for not having made it his particular business to answer the stubborn objections of that celebrated critic, instead of bolstering up for arguments the figments of his own brain; arguments which have already failed, and must of necessity fail to make the least impression on the well-informed mind! That as to my knowledge of the state of the question between the heretics and the orthodox, however little that may be, it probably may be thought, by some at least, to be equal to that of my antagonist: but whether or not, the issue of the present contest will, ere long, determine, on which side of the two combatants the victory preponderates. That with respect to my motive for stepping forward in the existing dispute, I can conscientiously assure your correspondent, that I had no other design whatever

than to prevent such smatterers in theological science as himself from impudently imposing on the Christian world for Scripture that which is not Scripture; and from further alleging, as the language of St. John, what by nineteen-twentieths of the learned at this day is known to be a palpably convicted and unquestionable interpolation.

But to descend to the conflict. In the prelude to his first attack, it is highly amusing to see with what admirable art he has endeavoured to throw dust into the eyes of your readers by premising, that to whatever account the testimony of other churches may be turned, in the classification of manuscripts, their evidence on any contested doctrinal point is wholly undeserving of credit; and that the principle which gives weight to that testimony, as far as it rests on the assumption, that the Witnesses are ancient and separate, supplies every person who is but moderately versed in the history of the Sacred Text, with meet subject of derision. This I plainly perceive is the only answer which we are likely to receive to that positive testimony against the disputed passage, arising from its non-existence in all the ancient versions. But I shall not allow our modest critic to drop his courtesy, and to retire in this manner. That the ancient versions, either in the decision of any doctrinal point, or in the elucidation of any difficult and obscure original text, are not an infallible guide; is a truth of which none of your readers, I should think, can need to be informed. The tenour of my complaint, however, has nothing to do with the illustration of an obscure passage, or with the decision of a doctrinal point; but concerns the absence of a whole verse; a verse, too, comprised in such easy and familiar terms, that, had it been in the Greek originals from which those ancient versions were first made, it must have been understood and translated in all to the very same

purport. Moreover, as to any trivial argument deducible from the artificial classification of the manuscripts, I am fully prepared to evince, from the intrinsic evidence of the versions themselves, that they must have been made from various manuscripts; or, to express myself more agreeably to the style of modern criticism, from manuscripts of distinct and different classes. Here, then, I plant my standard; and call on my opponent to dispute the ground with me. The strength of my position is simply this, that at the several periods of time in which those ancient versions were first made from the Greek, the passage of the Heavenly Witnesses did not exist in any of the Greek manuscripts; and, consequently, never had existed there at any time previous; a pretty large pill for those to swallow who maintain its authenticity: and, if Mr. Nolan should be resolved to close his eyes to the overwhelming force of this argument; there is no other cure for his obstinacy than that ridicule and contempt to which the pertinacity of his opinion must inevitably expose him.

In one place, indeed, he speaks of granting me every thing that I can desire, on points which no person now is disposed to contest. But if he would come to a fair and honourable balancing of the vouchers for and against his Heavenly Witnesses; and should permit me to take to myself my just portion of the heap; if I grant him a drachm, I must for that drachm demand to myself a whole pound of the evidence: and when that is done, I must further require of him to desist from publishing to the world, that in the just and even scales his solitary drachm is as heavy as my pound; or that his evidence for, is as weighty as mine against, the Heavenly Witnesses.

I now proceed to meet his first charge on one of my posts, the testimony of Facundus. To this evidence my opponent objects, that in no

less than six different places of the context of Facundus, and that, too, in every manuscript of his works, the eighth verse is quoted with the words, *In terra*; which, according to my own principles of criticism, is to be accounted for only on the supposition, that its antithesis, *In celo*, was in the verse preceding. But it has been already denied by Griesbach, that this spurious addition to the eighth verse occurs any where in the context of Facundus, save only in the text which is cited from St. John. He denies, that Facundus takes any notice of these two words, or makes the least allusion to them in any of his accompanying remarks; an occurrence which could scarcely have happened, had they really been a part of the original quotation; and, therefore, we are authorised to infer, that they are copied from the Vulgate. Indeed, I certainly did expect, that whoever might lay hold of this circumstance in favour of the disputed passage, would come prepared with something like an answer to the fair and reasonable suspicions of the German critic. His account of the first and only edition of Facundus is, that it was printed from a manuscript copy in the Vatican, which had been used by Baronius: and, though my opponent talks of this addition being found in every manuscript of that author; I strongly suspect, notwithstanding the swagger of his tone, that he has neither seen nor heard of any other manuscript, nor inspected any other copy of Facundus than that to which Griesbach had access; if he have, let him in a scholar-like manner produce his vouchers, and he shall have the full benefit of this circumstance in support of his falsified text.

But whatever may be the result of further researches into manuscripts, it is not the absence of the spurious part of the eighth verse; but the accommodation and application of this very verse to the Three Persons of the Godhead, on which I claim the testimony of Facundus, as to-

tally destructive of the authenticity of the Heavenly Witnesses. In his explication of the terms he evidently follows St. Austin; making the Spirit to stand for the Father, the Blood for the Son, and the Water for the Holy Ghost. But according to the general principles of interpretation, we are always at liberty to substitute the interpretation itself for the words interpreted, without detriment to the context. Let us then apply this rule to the case before us; and read the seventh with the eighth verse according to the gloss of Facundus. "For there are Three who bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one. And there are three who bear record on earth, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and these Three are One." Here we should have two verses, the one an exact repetition of the other, containing the same terms of Father, Son, and Spirit; the same predicates of testimony and unity; and differing in nothing except in the circumstance of place where the testimony is given; a most unscriptural and damnable distinction, wholly abhorrent from the style of the prophets and evangelists, who no where speak of God Almighty bearing testimony either in heaven or in hell; but only on the earth and amongst men, whose interest it is to hear and obey it. There does not exist, I am confident, one sober and judicious critic, who would so far insult the understanding of our African prelate, as to deem him capable of putting into the mouth of an Apostle such unintelligible and impious jargon as this; and, therefore, I shall here draw the certain conclusion, that whoever with Facundus, Eucherius, and Augustinus, expounds the eighth verse of the Trinity in Unity, at the same time supplies evidence destructive of the seventh.

To the argument which I had deduced from Eucherius my antagonist replies, that he cannot perceive by

what process of induction I infer, that, because the verse is not in his works, it was not in his Bible; that in the printed copies and manuscripts of Eucherius, the disputed verse actually appears; and that, if it be absent in other copies where it ought to be present, or if the eighth verse be any where defectively written, the author must be reconciled to himself before any advantage can be derived from his testimony.

Now I have already observed, what cannot be contradicted, that Eucherius is one of those Fathers who expound the eighth verse of the Trinity in Unity; and if my opponent cannot yet perceive by what method of induction, I hence infer, that the seventh verse was not in his Bible; as he seems so mortal an enemy to repetition, I must request him to read over again what I have stated of Facundus. But to go to the bottom of the question concerning the discrepancy of the published copies of the *Liber Formularum* of Eucherius, I must again bring forward the critical Griesbach, whose information is, that the gross interpolation of those editions of the author which contain the Heavenly Witnesses, is proved not only from the contradictory manner in which the verse itself is cited; but likewise from the two first and different editions in which the verse is omitted. To corroborate his charge more strongly, he cites an interesting statement from Oudin, who having alluded to a similar complaint made by Sixtus Senensis, of the many gross interpolations in this work of Eucherius, proceeds to observe, that on comparing the first edition (which wants the verse) with such and such manuscripts, he discovered, that the first edition was conformable to those manuscripts which were above six hundred or seven hundred years old; but that the second edition of the same work (which contains the verse) was about twice as large, having innumerable interpolations from later authors,

especially from Gregory the Great; and that he deemed it his duty to admonish the reader of this fact. To the above statement of Oudin, Griesbach, adds another corroborative proof to the same effect; that in the *Liber Quæstionum*, which he shews to be a genuine work of the same Father, the eighth verse is quoted in the same pure and unadulterated manner as in the first edition of the *Liber Formularum*; so that there remains not the shadow of a doubt as to what may be the genuine testimony of the venerable Eucherius. This lucid and convincing detail of Griesbach, Mr. Nolan appears to possess neither the ability nor the inclination to controvert; but reasoning on the case before him more like a lunatic than a critic, requires of the objector, first to reconcile Eucherius with himself; as though nothing had been already done to determine that important question, and, as if no solid testimony could be drawn from an author, so long as an interpolated edition of one of his works should happen to be in circulation.

I have already noticed one demonstrative proof of the spurious verse being wanted in the Bible of Eucherius. There is a second to be deduced from the manner in which he quotes the eighth verse in the *Liber Quæstionum*, that is to say, without the addition of the words, *In terra*. For if the seventh verse, whether with or without the words, *In celo*, should be prefixed to the eighth as furnished by Eucherius, the result would be such nonsense as would be insufferable for any man to write, but much more so for an apostle. I therefore hence deduce another general rule; that whoever with Eucherius, Dionysius Alexandrinus, Pope Eusebius, Pope Leo the Great, and St. Austin, cites the eighth verse, without the spurious addition, gives evidence at the same time that the seventh verse was not at all in his copy.

To the above is to be subjoined a third demonstration, already urged by Griesbach; that in his answer to the question, From what texts of Scripture can the Trinity be proved? Eucherius omits all mention of the Heavenly Witnesses. To this sturdy argument my opponent replies; that, as he has taken no notice of the Heavenly Witnesses, so neither has he taken any notice of his own manner of applying the earthly witnesses: as though there were any similarity between the two cases; the one being a plain and literal testimony of three divine persons of one substance, and containing the whole mystery of the Trinity in Unity, expressed in a nut-shell; the other being but a gloss, admitted by some of the orthodox, but disallowed by others; and wholly unknown to the Gallican Church before the times of St. Austin.

Before I proceed to the further vindication of what I have affirmed of Vigilius, I must correct a most wilful misrepresentation of my meaning in relation to the Confession of Faith, of which he is made the author. In stating, then, that he drew up that confession of Faith in the name of the African Bishops, I intended nothing more than that he composed it by the direction and with the concurrence of those prelates; whereas the ingenuity of my opponent has contrived to make me say, that he had actually forged the confession, together with the subscriptions of all the Bishops. So far from implicating either Vigilius or any other of those Latin Fathers, who first began to express in their works the sense of the seventh verse, I in a great measure acquit them of all blame whatever; and transfer the whole villany of the transaction on those, who, after the invention of printing, wickedly presumed to thrust it into the Greek original, into the Syriac, Armenian, and most of the modern versions; and on such as at this day, in defiance of the meridian sunshine

of sacred criticism, have still the effrontery to contend for its authenticity.

In assigning spurious and anonymous productions to their real authors, there must always be much room left for cavil and disputation. Whether I am right or wrong in ascribing to Vigilus the tracts which contain the spurious passage, cannot contribute in the slightest degree towards establishing its authenticity; for, if Vigilus was not the author of them, then his testimony is lost to the cause of the Heavenly Witnesses. Since, however, my opponent has had the arrogance to assert that my charge of Vigilus putting forth tracts under the name of Athanasius, with the verse inserted, is wholly destitute of foundation; and has dwelt at great length on this point for the purpose, if possible, of exposing my ignorance; I beg to have the opportunity of vindicating my own character, and of making manifest to your readers on which side of the dispute the ignorance lies. First of all, then, let me state, that the *Athanasii Opera* which I have, is the Latin version only, printed at Paris in 1608. In this edition of his works, and, I believe, in all others, there are extant certain Books, ad Theophilum, expressly ascribed to the pen of Athanasius; in the first and ninth of which the spurious verse is cited in the very same words; and, therefore, we may be sure, by the very same author. This author, according to the judgment both of Porson and Griesbach, was the same who composed the confession of Faith for the African Prelates; and the author of that confession of Faith is thought by Bengelius, Griesbach, and others, if not by my opponent himself, to have been no other person than Vigilus Tapaensis. This will be amply sufficient to shew, on what grounds I have charged Vigilus with having composed certain tracts under the name of Athanasius. But as to the

Disputatio Athanasii cum Ario, the long tract with which my antagonist has so highly diverted himself, and which, after having once made himself master of the judgment of the Benedictine editors, he rises up like a scholar armed fully prepared to vindicate as the production of Vigilus; I certainly am bound to congratulate him on the possession of a treasure to which both I and the editor of my Athanasius appear equally strangers; and hope, it may be of some future service in extricating him from some of those difficulties and perplexities in which the precipitancy of his conduct has already involved him.

I next proceed to the consideration of what he is pleased to call his plea on record; and on the strength of which he bars all the pretensions of the African Fathers, as well from deriving the contested verse from St. Cyprian, as from fabricating it themselves. The differences, we are told, that set the parties at variance which divided this Church, as they are stated by Facundus, and confirmed by Vigilus, were these; while the orthodox contended for the Son of God in two natures; the heretics disputed for the Word of God in one simple nature; that is, with the good leave of my opponent, in one simple substance; for with the Latin Fathers, when discoursing of the Godhead, nature and substance were equivalent terms. The plea being thus put on record, he continues to point out how well such a verse as that of the Heavenly Witnesses, must have served the purpose of the heretics; and how absurd it must be in any critic at this day to imagine, that any of those African Prelates should fabricate a passage which would be ruinous to their own cause in a conflict with their adversaries.

To most readers of the Remembrancer, I should think, this extraordinary definition of heresy, coming as it does, from the pen of an Ox,

ford divine, must have occasioned some little perturbation of spirits, whether in this case they themselves must not always have been heretics; without being conscious, that any such poison had been lurking in their tenets. For what heresy, I pray, can there be in maintaining the one simple nature or substance of the divine Word; or what orthodox professor ever contended for two natures in the Word any more than those heretics described by my opponent? I regret being obliged to say, that I have not at present by me a copy of Facundus to ascertain by what fatality he has been led to hazard so ignorant and garbled a statement of the heresy in question; but I have ample means of demonstrating, that he must have reported a falsehood. What those heretics really asserted was, that the Word subsisted in one simple nature or substance not only before, but *after* he became flesh. They made no proper distinction between the Word simply considered, and the Word incarnate. To them the orthodox, in asserting two natures in Christ, appeared to maintain not a trinity, but a quaternity in unity; as they were either unable or unwilling to comprehend, how the Word incarnate, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, could be declared in the creed to be *consubstantial* and *one* God; unless the human nature should have been so far swallowed up and lost in the divine, as to leave the Son still of the same simple and uncompound substance with the Father and the Spirit. Nay to such a pitch did Eutyches carry his contradiction to orthodoxy, that he asserted in Christ two natures before his incarnation, but only one after it; a dogma at once so perverse as to render the account almost incredible, were it not too well corroborated as well by other vouchers, as by Pope Leo the Great in his celebrated Epistle to Flavian of Constantinople. Such, I affirm, was the

REMEMBRANCER, No. 42.

heresy with which the orthodox of that age had to contend respecting the mystery of the Word incarnate; and if any of your readers will look into the Epistle of Athanasius to Epictetus of Corinth, into a short tract or two, falsely ascribed to the same pen, and headed with the words, *Quod duæ naturæ in Christo*; and into the conclusion of the ninth book to Theophilus; he will be able to trace it, in the Western Church, from Auxentius, the metropolitan of Milan; down to the very times in which Facundus himself flourished.

The nature of the heresy in question being thus fully developed, the necessity and expediency of using the term, *Verbum*, rather than the term, *Filius*, in expressing the Trinity in Unity, must be apparent to the least discerning. The term, *Filius*, being generally used for the Christ in two natures; or for the Word, after he became flesh; might have afforded to the Arian and Eutychetian heretics a ready pretence to cavil, had it been incautiously adopted by the orthodox in affirming of the three divine persons an identity of substance; but to the term, *Verbum*, there lay no such exception, it fully explaining itself. Hence in the beginning of the ninth book to Theophilus, ascribed by Griesbach and others to the pen of Vigilius, the heretic is made to ask, what was meant by God and the Son? To which Athanasius is made to reply, God and the Word; being well aware of the infinite trouble he must have had with his Arian disputant, had he simply and absolutely designated the second person of the ever blessed Trinity by any other term than, *Verbum*. What my opponent means by the *heretical* term *Verbum*, I know not; but this I will say, that he himself ought to be denounced a heretic for having asserted and maintained in the Remembrancer so heretical a distinction.

But, perhaps, a regard to the

X x

heresies of the day was not the only reason for preferring *Verbum* to *Filius* in expressing the Heavenly Witnesses. If we well consider the context of this part of the Epistle, we shall instantly perceive, that the divine testimony here afforded, is to Jesus Christ being the Son of God; but if one of these three witnesses were absolutely to be expounded of the Son incarnate, that would be making Christ bear testimony to himself; a consequence easily to be avoided by introducing the term, *Verbum*; for then it must needs be the divinity, to the exclusion of the humanity of his person, that will furnish the testimony to the divine mission of our Lord; and of this testimony we have the record in the Gospel, when he suffered upon the cross.

Nor is this all. There can be little doubt, that our African Fathers, in the framing and wording of the Heavenly Witnesses, had a particular eye to the eighth verse as expounded by St. Austin. But if we attend to St. Austin, in his third book against Maximinus, we shall immediately see, that when he proceeds to shew on Scriptural grounds, in what manner the Son, the second person of the Trinity, may be signified or denoted by Blood; he contents himself with that testimony of St. John, *The Word became flesh*: that, as the Spirit might well designate the Father, in that God is called a spirit; and the water the Holy Ghost, in that water in the Gospel is figuratively used and expounded of the Holy Spirit; so the blood might very well designate the Son, in that the Word became flesh; where it is observable, that unless the Word may be substituted for the Son, and the flesh for the blood, the parallel must fail in respect of the second witness. For this reason, and no other, it is, that the forger of the two Epistles of Popes Hyginus and Joannes II. in which the Heavenly Witnesses are expressed,

has not only taken care to have the term *Verbum*, in the seventh verse; but has fairly thrust out *sanguis*, and substituted *caro* instead of it in the eighth verse, in order that this illustrated text of St. John might be more consonant to the rest of Scripture, and wholly conformable to the language of St. Austin.

The tables being thus turned against my antagonist, and a clear road made on which to advance, I find myself at full liberty to dismiss three or four of his arguments with very little ceremony. First of all I deny, that there is any absurdity in deriving the allegation of *Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus*, from that of *Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus*; because in every expression of the Trinity in Unity, the *Filius* of the one, must of necessity be expounded by the *Verbum* of the other. I deny, moreover, that Fulgentius, in confronting Cyprian with St. John, marks any distinction or difference whatever, between their words. He alleges, indeed, the seventh verse in due form; and by bottoming it on the cited testimony of St. Cyprian, affords an opportunity to my opponent to mark out to the readers of the Remembrancer the verbal difference between the two terms; but he takes no notice of any such discrepancy himself: nor did he so much as suspect, that there was any real difference between them.

There is much stupidity in charging either on myself or on the African Fathers the absurd consequence of being obliged to make the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, three persons of one substance; as from the manner in which I suppose St. Cyprian to have construed the Greek, and from the way in which St. Austin has unquestionably expounded the Latin, we all equally declare, that the three witnesses of the eighth verse are not the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood; but the three divine witnesses of Christian

baptism, of whom it may be truly said, that the three are one. It was doubtless the peculiarities of its grammatical construction, which first led these two Fathers to a theological exposition of the eighth verse; but by thrusting in the seventh, and leaving the other to shift for itself, we do nothing but interpolate the Scripture for the purpose of confusing it.

In one instance, however, your correspondent has kindly seized me by the hand, where I was by no means prepared for his friendly grasp. That Vigilius, says he, was thoroughly acquainted with the disputed passage, and has expressly quoted it, is a point on which we are mutually agreed. Now, if by *quoting* it he means, that the author took it from any manuscript of the Epistle of St. John, we are by no means agreed: as the tenor of my argument is, that both Vigilius and Fulgentius, and every other author, who first began to express in due form the Heavenly Witnesses, had the verse to make as they wrote; or, what amounts to the same thing, were content to repeat it from those by whom it had been already made and fitted to their hands. That they actually framed it from the exposition of St. Austin, and, that they have even signified so much, I shall abundantly prove in the next letter which I may have the honour to transmit.

In the mean time, I would intreat your critical correspondent to write as intelligibly as he can; there being some passages in his communications which I have not as yet, been so fortunate as to comprehend; and it is far from my wish to pervert the sense of his language. In his last paper, which exhibits a finer specimen of critical mummery than I have beheld for some time, he has occupied, I see, not less than sixteen or seventeen columns of the Remembrancer on the authenticity of the Prologue to the Canonical Epistles; a circumstance not to be passed

over in silence, in that he had the civility to represent my own short paragraphs as trying your patience.

I beg to remain,
Your obedient Servant,
JOHN OXLEE.

Stonegrave, May 9th.

To the Editor of the Remembrancer.

Sir,

IN renewing the subject of the Prologue to the Catholic Epistles, my principal inducement is to consider the arguments, which have been advanced to disprove its authenticity. The fiercest assailant which the text of the Heavenly Witnesses has found, has directed his main force against this point, as presenting the side in which he believed the Latin Vulgate most vulnerable; and the most zealous of its advocates who are disposed to maintain the last hold in its defence, have abandoned this point as untenable.

“ — neque quisquam ex agmine tanto
Audet adire virum, manibusque inducere
cæstus.”

Before I venture to lay hand on the gauntlet of so redoubtable a champion, I entreat a few minutes parley, while I proceed with the defence of a cause, which it may be rashness to contest, but would be weakness to abandon without a struggle.

After determining the order of the Epistles, according to the Greek canons, the first point which is discussed in the Prologue respects the unfaithfulness of the Latin interpreters, “ particularly in that part of St. John’s Epistle, where the unity of the Trinity is mentioned.” In this place, as it proceeds to observe, “ the variety of the expression impugned itself;” and by the observation at once identifies the real author, in specifying St. Jerome’s mode of proceeding in the correction of the Latin version. His plan, as

of sacred criticism, have still the effrontery to contend for its authenticity. ...

In assigning spurious and anonymous productions to their real authors, there must always be much room left for cavil and disputation. Whether I am right or wrong in ascribing to Vigilus the tracts which contain the spurious passage, cannot contribute in the slightest degree towards establishing its authenticity; for, if Vigilus was not the author of them, then his testimony is lost to the cause of the Heavenly Witnesses. Since, however, my opponent has had the arrogance to assert that my charge of Vigilus putting forth tracts under the name of Athanasius, with the verse inserted, is wholly destitute of foundation; and has dwelt at great length on this point for the purpose, if possible, of exposing my ignorance; I beg to have the opportunity of vindicating my own character, and of making manifest to your readers on which side of the dispute the ignorance lies. First of all, then, let me state, that the *Athanasii Opera* which I have, is the Latin version only, printed at Paris in 1608. In this edition of his works, and, I believe, in all others, there are extant certain Books, ad Theophilum, expressly ascribed to the pen of Athanasius; in the first and ninth of which the spurious verse is cited in the very same words; and, therefore, we may be sure, by the very same author. This author, according to the judgment both of Porson and Griesbach, was the same who composed the confession of Faith for the African Prelates; and the author of that confession of Faith is thought by Bengelius, Griesbach, and others, if not by my opponent himself, to have been no other person than Vigilus Tapsensis. This will be amply sufficient to shew, on what grounds I have charged Vigilus with having composed certain tracts under the name of Athanasius. But as to the

Disputatio Athanasii cum Ario, the long tract with which my antagonist has so highly diverted himself, and which, after having once made himself master of the judgment of the Benedictine editors, he rises up like a scholar armed fully prepared to vindicate as the production of Vigilus; I certainly am bound to congratulate him on the possession of a treasure to which both I and the editor of my Athanasius appear equally strangers; and hope, it may be of some future service in extricating him from some of those difficulties and perplexities in which the precipitancy of his conduct has already involved him.

I next proceed to the consideration of what he is pleased to call his plea on record; and on the strength of which he bars all the pretensions of the African Fathers, as well from deriving the contested verse from St. Cyprian, as from fabricating it themselves. The differences, we are told, that set the parties at variance which divided this Church, as they are stated by Facundus, and confirmed by Vigilus, were these; while the orthodox contended for the Son of God in two natures; the heretics disputed for the Word of God in one simple nature; that is, with the good leave of my opponent, in one simple substance; for with the Latin Fathers, when discoursing of the Godhead, nature and substance were equivalent terms. The plea being thus put on record, he continues to point out how well such a verse as that of the Heavenly Witnesses, must have served the purpose of the heretics; and how absurd it must be in any critic at this day to imagine, that any of those African Prelates should fabricate a passage which would be ruinous to their own cause in a conflict with their adversaries.

To most readers of the Remembrancer, I should think, this extraordinary definition of heresy, coming as it does, from the pen of an Ox-

ford divine, must have occasioned some little perturbation of spirits, whether in this case they themselves must not always have been heretics; without being conscious, that any such poison had been lurking in their tenets. For what heresy, I pray, can there be in maintaining the one simple nature or substance of the divine Word; or what orthodox professor ever contended for two natures in the Word any more than those heretics described by my opponent? I regret being obliged to say, that I have not at present by me a copy of Facundus to ascertain by what fatality he has been led to hazard so ignorant and garbled a statement of the heresy in question; but I have ample means of demonstrating, that he must have reported a falsehood. What those heretics really asserted was, that the Word subsisted in one simple nature or substance not only before, but *after* he became flesh. They made no proper distinction between the Word simply considered, and the Word incarnate. To them the orthodox, in asserting two natures in Christ, appeared to maintain not a trinity, but a quarterternity in unity; as they were either unable or unwilling to comprehend, how the Word incarnate, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, could be declared in the creed to be *consubstantial* and *one* God; unless the human nature should have been so far swallowed up and lost in the divine, as to leave the Son still of the same simple and uncompound substance with the Father and the Spirit. Nay to such a pitch did Eutyches carry his contradiction to orthodoxy, that he asserted in Christ two natures before his incarnation, but only one after it; a dogma at once so perverse as to render the account almost incredible, were it not too well corroborated as well by other vouchers, as by Pope Leo the Great in his celebrated Epistle to Flavian of Constantinople. Such, I affirm, was the

REMEMBRANCER, NO. 42.

heresy with which the orthodox of that age had to contend respecting the mystery of the Word incarnate; and if any of your readers will look into the Epistle of Athanasius to Epictetus of Corinth, into a short tract or two, falsely ascribed to the same pen, and headed with the words, *Quod duæ naturæ in Christo*; and into the conclusion of the ninth book to Theophilus; he will be able to trace it, in the Western Church, from Auxentius, the metropolitan of Milan, down to the very times in which Facundus himself flourished.

The nature of the heresy in question being thus fully developed, the necessity and expediency of using the term, *Verbum*, rather than the term, *Filius*, in expressing the Trinity in Unity, must be apparent to the least discerning. The term, *Filius*, being generally used for the Christ in two natures; or for the Word, after he became flesh; might have afforded to the Arian and Eutychetian heretics a ready pretence to cavil, had it been incautiously adopted by the orthodox in affirming of the three divine persons an identity of substance; but to the term, *Verbum*, there lay no such exception, it fully explaining itself. Hence in the beginning of the ninth book to Theophilus, ascribed by Griesbach and others to the pen of Vigilius, the heretic is made to ask, what was meant by God and the Son? To which Athanasius is made to reply, God and the Word; being well aware of the infinite trouble he must have had with his Arian disputant, had he simply and absolutely designated the second person of the ever blessed Trinity by any other term than, *Verbum*. What my opponent means by the heretical term *Verbum*, I know not; but this I will say, that he himself ought to be denounced a heretic for having asserted and maintained in the Remembrancer so heretical a distinction.

But, perhaps, a regard to the
X x

heresies of the day was not the only reason for preferring *Verbum* to *Filius* in expressing the Heavenly Witnesses. If we well consider the context of this part of the Epistle, we shall instantly perceive, that the divine testimony here afforded, is to Jesus Christ being the Son of God; but if one of these three witnesses were absolutely to be expounded of the Son incarnate, that would be making Christ bear testimony to himself; a consequence easily to be avoided by introducing the term, *Verbum*; for then it must needs be the divinity, to the exclusion of the humanity of his person, that will furnish the testimony to the divine mission of our Lord; and of this testimony we have the record in the Gospel, when he suffered upon the cross.

Nor is this all. There can be little doubt, that our African Fathers, in the framing and wording of the Heavenly Witnesses, had a particular eye to the eighth verse as expounded by St. Austin. But if we attend to St. Austin, in his third book against Maximinus, we shall immediately see, that when he proceeds to shew on Scriptural grounds, in what manner the Son, the second person of the Trinity, may be signified or denoted by Blood; he contents himself with that testimony of St. John, *The Word became flesh*: that, as the Spirit might well designate the Father, in that God is called a spirit; and the water the Holy Ghost, in that water in the Gospel is figuratively used and expounded of the Holy Spirit; so the blood might very well designate the Son, in that the Word became flesh; where it is observable, that unless the Word may be substituted for the Son, and the flesh for the blood, the parallel must fail in respect of the second witness. For this reason, and no other, it is, that the forger of the two Epistles of Popes Hyginus and Joannes II. in which the Heavenly Witnesses are expressed,

has not only taken care to have the term *Verbum*, in the seventh verse; but has fairly thrust out *sanguis*, and substituted *caro* instead of it in the eighth verse, in order that this illustrated text of St. John might be more consonant to the rest of Scripture, and wholly conformable to the language of St. Austin.

The tables being thus turned against my antagonist, and a clear road made on which to advance, I find myself at full liberty to dismiss three or four of his arguments with very little ceremony. First of all I deny, that there is any absurdity in deriving the allegation of *Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus*, from that of *Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus*; because in every expression of the Trinity in Unity, the *Filius* of the one, must of necessity be expounded by the *Verbum* of the other. I deny, moreover, that Fulgentius, in confronting Cyprian with St. John, marks any distinction or difference whatever, between their words. He alleges, indeed, the seventh verse in due form; and by bottoming it on the cited testimony of St. Cyprian, affords an opportunity to my opponent to mark out to the readers of the Remembrancer the verbal difference between the two terms; but he takes no notice of any such discrepancy himself: nor did he so much as suspect, that there was any real difference between them.

There is much stupidity in charging either on myself or on the African Fathers the absurd consequence of being obliged to make the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, three persons of one substance; as from the manner in which I suppose St. Cyprian to have construed the Greek, and from the way in which St. Austin has unquestionably expounded the Latin, we all equally declare, that the three witnesses of the eighth verse are not the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood; but the three divine witnesses of Christian

baptism, of whom it may be truly said, that the three are one. It was doubtless the peculiarities of its grammatical construction, which first led these two Fathers to a theological exposition of the eighth verse; but by thrusting in the seventh, and leaving the other to shift for itself, we do nothing but interpolate the Scripture for the purpose of confusing it.

In one instance, however, your correspondent has kindly seized me by the hand, where I was by no means prepared for his friendly grasp. That Vigilus, says he, was thoroughly acquainted with the disputed passage, and has expressly quoted it, is a point on which we are mutually agreed. Now, if by *quoting* it he means, that the author took it from any manuscript of the Epistle of St. John, we are by no means agreed: as the tenor of my argument is, that both Vigilus and Fulgentius, and every other author, who first began to express in due form the Heavenly Witnesses, had the verse to make as they wrote; or, what amounts to the same thing, were content to repeat it from those by whom it had been already made and fitted to their hands. That they actually framed it from the exposition of St. Austin, and, that they have even signified so much, I shall abundantly prove in the next letter which I may have the honour to transmit.

In the mean time, I would intreat your critical correspondent to write as intelligibly as he can; there being some passages in his communications which I have not as yet, been so fortunate as to comprehend; and it is far from my wish to pervert the sense of his language. In his last paper, which exhibits a finer specimen of critical mummary than I have beheld for some time, he has occupied, I see, not less than sixteen or seventeen columns of the Remembrancer on the authenticity of the Prologue to the Canonical Epistles; a circumstance not to be passed

over in silence, in that he had the civility to represent my own short paragraphs as trying your patience.

I beg to remain,

Your obedient Servant,

JOHN OXLEE.

Stonegrave, May 9th.

To the Editor of the Remembrancer.

Sir,

IN renewing the subject of the Prologue to the Catholic Epistles, my principal inducement is to consider the arguments, which have been advanced to disprove its authenticity. The fiercest assailant which the text of the Heavenly Witnesses has found, has directed his main force against this point, as presenting the side in which he believed the Latin Vulgate most vulnerable; and the most zealous of its advocates who are disposed to maintain the last hold in its defence, have abandoned this point as untenable.

“ — neque quisquam ex agmine tanto
Audet adire virum, manibusque inducere
cæstus.”

Before I venture to lay hand on the gauntlet of so redoubtable a champion, I entreat a few minutes parley, while I proceed with the defence of a cause, which it may be rashness to contest, but would be weakness to abandon without a struggle.

After determining the order of the Epistles, according to the Greek canons, the first point which is discussed in the Prologue respects the unfaithfulness of the Latin interpreters, “ particularly in that part of St. John’s Epistle, where the unity of the Trinity is mentioned.” In this place, as it proceeds to observe, “ the variety of the expression impugned itself;” and by the observation at once identifies the real author, in specifying St. Jerome’s mode of proceeding in the correction of the Latin version. His plan, as

described in the Prologue to the Gospels, was to collate the Latin copies, and when "a variety in the expression impugned" the correctness of a passage, as "that could not be true which varied," to apply an emendation.

In proceeding to verify these principles, in the remains of the old Latin version; as the translation of the Catholic Epistles is not extant, the only idea which can be attained of that part of the old Italic is in some of the early translations. In an early French version, which was apparently made by the Waldenses, and which corresponds, in the text of the Heavenly Witnesses, with their Confession of Faith, we consequently discover all that is necessary for bringing those principles to the test. As this version substitutes "the Son" for "the Word," and omits the final clause of the eighth verse, if we suppose, that some copies having these readings, and some corresponding with those of the modern Vulgate (as attested in the Prologue,) were before St. Jerome, nothing can more appositely illustrate the declaration of the Prologue, relative to the variations of the Latin version; "neither would they have created ambiguity to the reader, nor would the variety of the expression have impugned itself." As the substitution of the term "Son," and omission of the clause are important variations, which directly affect the unity of the Trinity, they are obviously calculated, as impeaching the integrity of the text, to awaken the doubts of the reader, respecting the doctrine.

When a variety occurred in the translation, St. Jerome's plan of correcting, as described in the Prologue to the Gospels, was "to seek the true reading in the greater number of Latin copies," or, "reverting to the Greek, to correct the translation by the original." But here, if I am right in my notion of Eusebius's edition, the latter canon failed in its application; as the

Greek, not less than the Latin impugned itself by the variety of the copies. The defect in the translation, was of course repaired by an application of the former canon, and the old reading of the Latin, as preserved in the greater number of copies, having been accordingly retained, nothing is stated respecting a correction. Had a sophisticator taken the work in hand, he would have boldly appealed to the Greek; for, it is absurd to suppose, that this was a length to which he who would fabricate the Prologue and passage dared not proceed; as St. Jerome has well observed, on a like occasion, "*qui hoc ausus est facere, quid aliud non audeat?*" The silence of the Prologue on this point, while it conveys a further proof of the identity of the real and reputed author, adds the strongest confirmation to the hypothesis, which asserts the defalcation of the Greek, in Eusebius's edition.

But we are further informed, by the Prologue to the Gospels, that in St. Jerome's mode of correcting the Latin, another test of the true reading was implied. While the corruption of the Greek is acknowledged, in premising the possibility of detecting it, by "the translations made of the Scriptures into the languages of different nations," that preface "promises only the four Gospels, amended by a collation with the Greek." Though in this declaration, St. Jerome implicitly avows, that the Greek alone was accessible to him, at the time of revising the Gospels, the means of inquiry into a subject in which he was not incurious, were considerably extended at the time of composing the Prologue to the Epistles. After some years residence among the Syrians, after a long and intimate acquaintance with the Egyptian monks, he could not have been ignorant of their versions of the Scriptures. He who was so well versed in the Chaldee, could not have been unacquainted with the Syriac; he has, indeed,

given some proofs of his skill in this language, and is addressed, as a proficient in it, by Marcus Celedensis. His familiarity with Greek opened the means of communicating with the Nitrian monks whom he visited in person, and who had been occupied, since the period of Eusebius's revival of the Greek, in translating the Scriptures, into the Sahidic and Coptic, which declare their descent from his edition by retaining his sections. The result of the information, which may be thus conceived within St. Jerome's reach, is accordingly communicated in the disputed Prologue; "in which epistle," the author subjoins, "I find also, that a great error is committed, against the true faith, by unfaithful translators, who set down the names only of three, that is, the Water, the Spirit, and the blood, and omit the testimony of the Father, the Word, and the Spirit." While a line is here distinctly drawn between the Latin and other translators; the observation is fully verified, by a comparison of the French and Oriental versions; as the latter insert only the earthly witnesses. And the present view of this passage in the Prologue is confirmed by the opposition marked by the terms "interpreters" and "translators;" it being most consonant to St. Jerome's practice, in opposing these words, to apply the former to a version made into a vernacular tongue, the latter to one made into an acquired language. While this information, relative to those versions, corresponds with the state of the case, and is recognized by the correspondent Prologue, as agreeing with the scope of St. Jerome's inquiries; its recondite nature at once identifies him as the author of the production.

But while St. Jerome's manner is thus identified by learned allusions to subjects which were inaccessible to subsequent writers; his modes of thinking are at once recognized in the remote consequences to which they are prosecuted. As the deter-

mination of the order of the Catholic Epistles arose from his common custom of prefixing a Prologue, this being the object with which his prefaces were usually written; his mention of the text of the Heavenly Witnesses naturally springs from his desire to preserve the principle, on which that order had been determined. The digestion of the subject mainly consisted in retaining St. John, at the close of the Epistles, as well as of the Gospels; that Apostle having written, with the view of supplying what was defective in his inspired predecessors, and having consequently delivered his sublime theology, by a progressive disclosure, closing with the revelation of the highest mystery. To omit the verse, in which this mystery was most fully disclosed, was to frustrate the object of that digested order, which St. Jerome, after Eusebius, has ascribed to St. John as its author; this consequently furnishes the grounds, on which he excepts against the unfaithful translators. The connexion between the Prologue to the Gospels and the Epistles which inculcates the same mode of arrangement is thus maintained by a secret link; the subject which is barely suggested in the former, being thus brought to its consummation in the latter. In this nice connexion of the subject, by marks, not obtrusively forced upon the attention, but discoverable only on a close observation, which are not drawn from the formal avowal of the author, but deducible from his habits of acting and thinking, the authentic work infallibly distinguishes itself from the counterfeit and surreptitious.

This observation admits of being carried even to a greater length. The author of the Prologue, in vindicating the true reading of the contested verse, exhibits a desire not merely to maintain the order, but to assert the doctrine of the Epistles. He opens the subject, with a declaration in favour of

"those Greeks who were sound in their opinion, and followed the right faith;" he closes it by an expression of his zeal for the maintenance of "the Catholic faith, and the doctrine of one substance of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." These were subjects, not only predominant in St. Jerome's mind, at the time when this prologue professes to be written, but were forced on his attention by the object and tenour of the subject which it discusses. In accounting for the variety of the Latin copies, in the earlier prologue to the Gospels, he traces it to its source, and refers it to the edition of the Greek, which was published by Hesychius, and which was generally received in Egypt. In this country, particularly among the Nitrian monks, a defection, from the Catholic faith to the errors of Origen, had prevailed not long previously to the period of writing this prologue; and St. Jerome had fallen in some measure, under the imputation of favouring their errors, by the insinuations of Rufinus. This subject had been brought home to his attention by his friend Pammachius, who called upon him "to confute what was contrary to the Catholic rule, or had been unskillfully expressed by his opponent, to purge the suspicions of men, and convince his accusers, lest by dissembling, he might seem to acquiesce." The Bishop of Alexandria, by whom the Origenian heresy had been opposed, pressed him more urgently with "the observance of the ecclesiastical Canons;" calling upon him "to participate in the reward of his own exertions, by labouring to reclaim those who had been deceived;" and stating the determination which he himself possessed, "to preserve the Catholic

faith and the Canons of the Church, with the people committed to his charge, to the suppression of all novel doctrines." As the heaviest charge brought by St. Jerome himself against the Origenists convicts them of degrading the Son and Holy Ghost into the order of angels; the contested prologue, addressed to Eustochium, gives a direct reply to the demands of her brother Pammachius, and answers the claims of Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria. In vindicating the credit of the contested verse, it opposes the strongest authority furnished by Scripture, to the fundamental error of the Origenists; and while it places the author's opinion of the ecclesiastical Canons and the Catholic faith above every suspicion, sustains the part which St. Jerome took in that controversy, with a degree of consistency which challenges a competition with any other of his genuine prologues.

But the structure of the language in which the prologue is expressed, as composed of the phraseology of St. Jerome, gives rise to an additional train of evidence identifying its author. This evidence will be placed in the most succinct and conclusive form, by extracting from the prologue its remarkable phrases, and confronting them with others collected from the undisputed prologues. With a view to facilitate that comparison, which will lead to the conviction that they have proceeded from the same hand, I shall dispose them in parallel columns. The general tenour of the expression possesses a sufficient comment in the similarity of the contrasted passages; on some of the remarkable and characteristic phrases, I shall particularly remark in the sequel.

Phrases of the disputed Prologue.

Non idem est ordo apud Græcos...epistolarum septem, quæ Canonica nuncupantur, qui in Latinis codicibus invenitur. Sed sicut Evangelistas dudum ad veritatis lineam correximus, ita has proprio ordini, Deo nos juvante reddidimus. Est enim prima eorum una Jacobi, Petri duæ, Johannis tres, et Judæ una. Ab interpretibus fideliter in Latinum verterentur eloquium...ab infidelibus translatoribus multum erratum esse a fidei veritate comperimus...nec sermonum sese varietas impugnet. In prima Johannis epistola positum...trium tantum vocabula in sua editione ponentibus. Testimonium omnitentibus, in quo fides Catholica roboratur...una divinitatis substantia comprobatur...Lectoris prudentiæ derelinquo. Sed tu virgo Christi Eustochium, a me impensius Scripturæ veritatem inquiris, neam senectatem invidorum dentibus corroendam exponis, qui me falsarium, corruptoremque Sacrarum Scripturarum pronunciant. Nec æmulorum invidentiam pertimesco, nec Sanctæ Scripturæ veritatem poscentibus denegabo.

Phrases of the undisputed Prologues.

Non idem est ordo duodecim prophetarum, apud LXX. qui in Hebraica veritate continetur (a). . . in Canonica [Petri] epistola (b). . . codices a Luciano nuncupatos (c). Psalterium Romæ dudum positus emendam, et juxta LXX. interpretes...cursim correxeram (d), linguæ lineas servare (e) nos mensuræ metri versibusque reddidimus, præterea ordinem visionum ad pristinam fidem correximus (f) juvante Christo (g) adjuvante Domino (h). Scripsit ad Romanos unam, ad Corinthios duas, ad Ephesios unam, ad Philippenses unam, etc. (i). Post Septuaginta translatōres,.... Judæos veteris legis interpretes (k). . . in nostrum vertit eloquium (l)...multum a veritate discordet (m)...fidei tollerent veritatem (n)...inter se trifaria varietate compugnat (o). Multa ponuntur de veteri textu (p)...non vocabula hominum (q)...ponam de Vet. Testamento (r)...ejus editio non multum distat ab Hebraico (s). Quæ ad nostram fidem pertineant roborandam (t)...maledicorum testimonio comprobatur (u). Relectoris arbitrio judicium derelinquens (w). Cogis me virgo Christi Eustochium (x)...semper invidis respondemus (y)...qui canino dente me rodunt (z)...corrector vitiorum falsarius dicor (aa). Exordia æmulatorum maledicta confutanti (bb)...nec vituperationes expaviscemus...minas hominum penitus non timemus (cc)...hos libros Eustochio virgini Christi negare non potui (dd).

(a) Præf. in Joel. (b) Com. in Is. lxxv. p. 184. (c) Præf. in IV Evan. (d) Præf. in Psalt. (e) Præf. in Dan. (f) Præf. in Hierem. (g) Præf. in Esdr. (h) Præf. in Ezek. (i) Cat. Scrip. Eccl. (k) Præf. in Esdr. (l) Ep. lxxv. adv. Vigilant. (m) Præf. in Esdr. (n) Ep. lxxv. ad Pam. et Oc. (o) Præf. in Paralipom. (p) Præf. in Esdr. (q) Præf. in Paralipom. (r) Adv. Pelag. l. iv. (s) Præf. in Ezek. (t) Ep. lxxiv. ad Marcel. (u) Præf. in IV Evan. (w) Præf. in Dan. (x) Præf. in Is. (y) Præf. in Micah. (z) Præf. in Paralipom. (aa) Præf. in Job. (bb) Præf. in Micah. (cc) Præf. in Esch. (dd) Præf. in Jos.

In the phrases which are here collected from sources the most various and remote, we recognize every distinctive mark which characterises the diction of an author whose style is formed. The same thoughts are clothed in the same language, while some shades of difference distinguish each piece from a mere imitation, the whole colouring exhibits that similarity of tone which characterises the hand of the same master.

As much of the learning of the disputed Prologue is adopted from a language, the stores of which were inaccessible to any later writer among the Latins; it must convey

no trivial evidence of the source from whence it has proceeded, that the expression of the Greek should be copied with the information which it imparted; and it is not less curious than convincing, that some phrases extracted from the disputed prologue approach much nearer to the usage of that language, than those collected from the genuine Prefaces. Thus, in the short phrase "Deo juvante," while both terms are recognized, in the separate parts of "adjuvante Domino," and "juvante Christo," extracted from different sources; the disputed Prologue approaches nearest in the phrase which it employs, to Θεοῦ

διδωσας, used on a like occasion, by Origen, from whose commentaries the expression has obviously passed into the Prologues of Jerome. The manner of enumerating the Catholic Epistles is besides purely Greek; the form of expression having been adopted with the order of the Epistles from the acts of the Council of Laodicea; for, the passage, "Jacobi una, Petri duæ, Johannis tres, Judæ una," is a literal translation of Ἰακώβου μία, Πέτρου δύο, Ἰωάννου τρεῖς, Ἰούδα μία, in the sixtieth Canon of that Council. And while this form of expression is corroborated by the usage of Jerome, who in as literal a translation of the same canon, adopts it, in his enumeration of the Pauline Epistles, it was obviously not to be acquired, through the medium of the Latin. In the translation of the acts of that Council, by Dionysius Exiguus, the sixtieth canon is, in compliment to the Latin Church, wholly omitted: and in that of Isidorus Mercatorius it is rendered, with an interpolation,— "Petri duæ, *prima et secunda*, Johannis tres, *prima, secunda et tertia*," &c. Had this version been followed, it would have either been adopted without any change, or if altered, would have been abridged by rejecting the terms "una, duæ, tres &c." as this alteration is suggested by the tenour of the sense, and is accordingly followed, in the context, by the translator, who thus enumerates the Pauline Epistles,— "ad Romanos, ad Corinthios prima et secunda, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses, ad Thessalonisenses prima et secunda, &c."

To proceed to examples which lead, by a different line of proof, to the same conclusion, it is again to be observed, that some general expressions of the disputed Prologue, when collated with correspondent phrases in the undisputed, acquire a just and determinate sense, by the comparison; each giving evidence of its descent from

the same source, as referable to the same habits of thinking. Thus in the phrase "Evangelistas *dudum* ad veritatis lineam correximus," the term "*dudum*" marks no definitive period; but its meaning is defined by a short clause in the correspondent phrase, "*Psalterium Romæ dudum positus emendaram*;" and as the revival of both works was made at the same time, it is used in the same sense in both passages. The phrase "*nec sermonum sese varietas impugnaret*" conveys an indeterminate sense to the ordinary reader, but it is at once fixed by the correspondent phrase, "*inter se trifaria varietate compugnat*:" and as both expressions have originated from an observation of the diversities of the classes, into which the sacred text is distributed by St. Jerome; both lay equal claim to originality, in using a verb which is differently compounded, according to the circumstances of its application; the former adapting the composition to the case where two texts were contrasted, but the latter to the case where three were compared together. The short clause subjoined to the first-cited passage, "*ad lineam veritatis correximus*" gives equal evidence of its true descent, as it is derived from an image which was familiar to St. Jerome: and is accordingly introduced in the prologue, from which the correspondent phrase "*linguæ lineas servare*" has been adduced, though it is given a different turn, suitably to the occasion of its introduction, "*me cogitis (ô Paula et Eustochium) ut veluti quodam novali, scissum jam arvom exerceam, et obliquis sulcis renascentes spinas eradicem*."

Even in the embarrassment of the structure, from whence the most formidable objection has been raised to the disputed prologue, it seems not impossible to deduce some evidence of its authenticity; without making any allowances for the circumstances under which it was dictated by a person who might plead in the words

of Theophrastus, *Βεβαιωτα ἔστιν ἡ δογματικὴ ἰνία*. The objection almost exclusively affects two clauses, in which the embarrassment of the structure bears internal marks of having grown out of a correction; and seems to have originated in an effort to give greater emphasis to the sense, as it occurs in two points, where the author is employed in enforcing the main object which he undertakes to establish. Thus, if we suppose him, with this object in view, to have first declared, "ut primæ sint Petri epistolæ in ordine cæterarum," but on perceiving the necessity of a qualification, to have added "quia Petrus primus est in numero Apostolorum;" the two propositions, which are wholly unexceptionable when taken apart, implicated the construction, on being combined in the phrase, "ut quia Petrus primus est numero Apostolorum, primæ sint etiam ejus epistolæ in ordine cæterarum." Again, if we suppose "proprio ordini reddidimus" to have been connected with "Jacobi una, Petri dua, Johannes tres, Judæ una," but the interjected phrase, "est enim prima earum," to have been added, in order to enforce the main purpose of the author, who assigns the precedence to St. Jerome's Epistle; we may form a just idea, how the structure has become embarrassed, in the phrase, "Est enim prima earum una Jacobi, &c."

Having taken so much pains to enable the oppugners of the disputed prologue to understand it, I am exempted from the weary task of entering with equal minuteness into the objections, by which they have laboured to pervert its object and meaning. In proceeding to give them every consideration which they can be thought to merit, I shall take them, as collected and methodised by Mr. Porson. His professed object, in entering on so beaten a topic, was "to collect what is scattered through many works, to dispose it in a better order, or set it in

a clearer light;" in acquitting himself of which profession, he is not to be denied the praise of having performed what he undertook, with that accuracy, clearness, and spirit, which will be in vain sought in any other, of the disputants, by whom the question has been agitated.

As a leading objection to the prologue, it is observed, that as "Jerome revised the Latin translation at the command of Pope Damasus, if he replaced the three Heavenly Witnesses at this revisal, why did he not then write his preface to inform the world of his recovered reading?" p. 289. Had the Preface, in which St. Jerome records this request, and states his compliance with it, been read with but moderate attention, it would have anticipated this objection by the short answer, "hæc præsens Præfatiuncula pollicetur *quatuor tantum Evangelia*." From the correspondence of Jerome (Vide Epp. cii. ad Marcel, xxviii. ad Lucin. lxxxviii. ad Augustin) "written after Damasus was dead," it appears that the first part of the work, containing merely the Gospels, had been given to the world, and that the indifferent reception which it had met, had determined its author to withhold the remainder.

But the request made by Eustochium to Jerome, "once more to revise the Catholic Epistles and correct them from the Greek," is "a story that carries its own condemnation upon its forehead." p. 289. As a sufficient cure for the scepticism of the objector on this point, it is merely necessary to prescribe the exercise of reading the Preface to the Psalter, where he will find the request distinctly made; Paula and "Eustochium, after Pope Damasus was dead," requiring him "once more to revise the translation, and correct it from the Greek," as new errors had grown up, by the culpability of transcribers. It is almost needless to observe, that Eustochium, who is represented as

"a young lady, at once devout, handsome, and learned," was the only surviving part of a family, which traced its descent from the Cornelii and Gracchi, and which had taken St. Jerome under their patronage, on the death of Pope Damasus, and placed him over a monastery, which they founded in Bethlehem. But it ought to be stated, that, with as much youth as may be charitably allowed to a lady of forty-five, and as much beauty as is bestowed on her by this wag of a professor, she presided over a monastic institution, which originally had been founded, and was for twenty years governed by her mother; that while invested with these honours, she received, in various Prologues, the dedication of the several parts of the Commentary on Isaiah and Ezechiel; and to crown the whole, that the Prologue to the Catholic Epistles affords no countenance to the assertion, that she made any such request to St. Jerome, as is ascribed to her by the objector.

Again it is specifically objected to the Prologue, that "a great majority of the MSS. omits St. Jerome's name" in the title;—which gives evidence of its authenticity, by the omission. If it errs in this respect, it errs in good company; as this is often observed to be the case, with the genuine Prologues; viz. with those prefixed to the book of Joshua, of Kings, of Job, of Ezra, &c. Of the different titles prefixed to the unquestioned Prefaces, the shorter, which omit the name, have internally this evidence in their favour; that from them we most easily account for the varieties of the readings collectively considered: and criticism has prescribed no better principle than this, for determining which is the best among a number of various readings. The transcriber who found in his Bible, those short inscriptions, "the Preface to the Book of Joshua, the Prologue to the Books of Kings, &c." would find, in his knowledge of the

author, sufficient justification for prefixing Jerome's name, by the infallible authority whereby he added its common appendages, "the holy, the god-like;" but no transcriber would be justified, in striking it out, had the author himself inserted it in the original. The same conclusion is borne out by the only external evidence which is adducible on the subject; for it happens to be the case, that Rufinus, in his "Invectives," transcribes, at large, some of the Prologues of Jerome. But while he preserves the titles, he omits the name of the author; though precision in marking them as quotations, seems to have required its introduction. And had not the objection admitted of this satisfactory reply, the futility of deducing any conclusion from such equivocal principles might be shewn, from the communication made to Augustine by Jerome, on the subject of the title of his work, "On the ecclesiastical writers." From their correspondence, it appears, that this work had received, even in the life of the author, three different titles, one of which was imposed "by unskilful emenders."

It is further observed, that "some of the MSS. call the epistles *Canonical* in the title, and all in the prologue, whereas Jerome would have called them *Catholic*." p. 293. The true reading of the title I therefore conclude to be the term "Catholic," of which the term "Canonical" is merely a various reading, which has been transferred from the text to the title, in a laudable endeavour to fit a heading to the piece which was suitable to its subject. Whether the author has so wholly mistaken his object, as to have written "nuncupantur canonicae," where St. Jerome would have written "nominantur catholicae," is a question which can be decided, in the affirmative, only by proving the difference to exist in cases somewhat similarly circumstanced. But the phrases which are opposed to establish the

discrepancy have really nothing similar in sense or application to warrant a comparison. The former merely signifies, "are commonly called Catholic," the latter properly means, "are solemnly declared canonical;" the former is used by St. Jerome in specifying St. Peter's epistles, in a short sketch of his works, where it would have been absurd to use the term "canonical;" the latter, by the author of the prologue, in enumerating the seven epistles, where it would have been not less so, to have informed the reader, they were formally styled "Catholic." The objection has therefore no force or meaning, if it does not go to the length of asserting, that it was "the perfection of absurdity," or was at least inconsistent with St. Jerome's manner to have informed Eustochium that "the seven epistles were solemnly declared canonical." But this will hardly be affirmed, as a grave council, not many years previously, had been at the pains to inform the Christian world, that "uncanonical books ἀκανόνιστα βιβλία were not to be read, but only the Canonical ἀλλὰ μόντα τὰ κανονικά," directly inserting a Canon, which contains "the seven Catholic epistles, one of James, two of Peter, three of John, and one of Jude." As this last piece of information has been transferred, by a literal translation, into the prologue, it at least justifies a suspicion that both the terms, "catholic" and "canonical," which, by so lucky a chance, take their proper places in its title and text, have passed into it from the same source. And as St. Jerome has made some display of his knowledge on this subject, in informing us, that "the book of Tobias and the Pastor of Hermas are not in the Canon," a conjecture which happens to be right; as he has likewise quoted the second epistle of Peter under the simple title of "a canonical epistle," though its claims to this title were long disputed; the possibility at least may be admitted, that his was the

hand which has so skilfully transplanted both terms into their respective places. But nothing more than a bare possibility on this head, and that of the lowest kind, is necessary for the subversion of the objection.

"If a prologue," it is continued, "containing such important information, had been constantly known and read, it must have been quoted." p. 296. I would gladly be informed where Jerome's prologues, or indeed any prologues to the Bible, have been quoted, unless in the controversy with Rufinus? But to estimate the value of this remark the objector has only to be heard to the end. With respect to "the important information" which it conveyed, on the main point in dispute, the text of the Heavenly Witnesses, we are first informed, that the author "is afraid to affirm that it was in the *Greek MSS.*" (p. 298.); we are next assured that "it is apparent" from the prologue, "that most of the *Latin copies wanted* 1 John v. 7." (p. 303.) and a direct charge is indeed brought in it, against "the unfaithful translators who omitted the witness of the Father, the Word, and the Spirit." Is it on these points, I would ask, that the prologue challenged quotation, while the text might be quoted from the Bible itself, without any impeachment of its authority deduced from the Greek or the Latin? But with a superior knowledge of Bede's predilections, it is enquired, "if universally acknowledged for Jerome's, how could Bede overlook it?" May I again ask, if the slight which is cast in it on the Western Church, in determining "the proper order" of the epistles, against her sentence, by an appeal to the authority of the Eastern,—if this insult, which was so keenly felt and resented by Martianay and Vallarsius, was that which recommended it to the notice of so stubborn an advocate of the pre-eminence of the former Church as the venerable Bede; who was, it may be added, so impartial and adequate a

judge of her pretensions, as to have believed, for her sake, in "the Recognitions of Clement?" As "the important information" ascribed to the prologue consists neither in the support afforded by the Greek or the Latin to the Heavenly Witnesses, nor in the order ascribed to the epistles, where, may we beg to be informed, is it then to be discovered? But to ascertain what a reception it would have met had it presented itself from any quarter, in the form of a quotation, we have again only to attend to the objector. After having acknowledged, that it is appealed to by the Sorbonne Correctorium, in the ninth century, upon the only point on which a Latin could find a decent pretext for quoting it, he thus deduces his conclusion: "this author seems to have been overburthened with judgment, for he says 'here some of the Greek MSS. are corrupted,' as St. Jerome observes."

Again, we are informed, "the style alone would determine this prologue not to be Jerome's," whose "language is always spirited and perspicuous." (p. 297.) After receiving the benefit of this conjecture of the professor, let us now take, on the same point, the sense of the author. Having, at the time of writing this prologue, assured us in one place, that "as he has often attested he could not bear the labour of writing with his own hand;" and in another, that he would "endeavour to write by the hand of his notaries, that nothing might be wanting in the sense, though much was wanting in the language;" he thus expresses himself to Eustochium in the prologue to the twelfth book of the Commentary on Isaiah, "this short preface I have dictated in confused language, *tumultuario sermone dictavi*, that what is contained in my papers may be disclosed, but the full emendation left to the reader."

The objector proceeds after the style, "to consider the reasoning and connection," informing us, that

"the real Jerome could never have indulged himself in so silly a parallel" as that expressed between correcting the Gospels, and "such a trifle" as arranging the Epistles, that "he might have said, and ought to have said, *ita et has, Deo juvante, Græcæ fidei reddidimus*; which would have been a proper subject for his joy and piety." (p. 297.) All this is worthy of its proposer, whose prerogative as the prince of verbal critics, far be it from a dull divine to question. But as some rebels against the authority of those literary monarchs are obstinate enough to suppose, that the epithets chosen by the professor are happily suited to the task of collating letters and syllables; and that to consume a life in such labours, is, at best, *κατὰ γένημα σπουδάζειν*; we who may claim a preference for "such a trifle" as that of digesting the doctrine, by adopting a better arrangement of the epistles, are not without authority to justify us in so "silly" a predilection. And whatever may have been Jerome's partialities on this subject, enough has been said elsewhere to evince that had he chosen the present place to express them, he must have imparted a secret of which Eustochium was long possessed, and which every reader might find in the preceding preface.

Of the same stamp with the preceding is the next exception to the reasoning and connexion; "that there is another ridiculous opposition" between the translators in rendering, and the Apostles in digesting the original: nor could the objector "believe that Jerome would have used such language as *Neque sermonum sese varietates impugnant*." (p. 299.) The full value of which objections, as proving the care and perspicacity with which this prologue has been reviewed, in its connection and language, may be easily found, on reverting to what has been already stated on both subjects.

But with some foresight of the result to which all his labour must

come, he seems resolved in the last stroke to make sure of his man, and without any view to a substitute, levels it direct at the principle:—"If ("such a piece of news as is told in the prologue") were false, Jerome would have affirmed it no less boldly, and called God to witness no less solemnly, than when he attested the miracle of his being whipped by angels," (p. 299.) Let it be premised that the text on which we are here presented with a comment, is a description of the consequences of protracted abstemiousness, of the effects of a fever produced by watching and fasting, and ending in mental abstraction. The reader who is thus informed, if he happens to have heard of the habits and propensities of Professor Porson, will not, I believe, dispute, that all this is in character, and that the subject is suited to the derision of the scoffer and drunkard;—who, without the insinuating address, possessed the obtrusive meanness of the parasite, which scarcely any insult could drive from the table, that he failed not to disgust with his low and swinish propensities.

Having gone thus minutely into the evidence which may be advanced in favour of the disputed prologue, and which has been urged against it, I have only to observe, that the sophisticians of antiquity have performed their work so rudely as to be exposed to immediate detection. Of the compilers and editors of Jerome's works none have possessed the moderate share of skill necessary to dispose them in a proper order. His life is detailed without any regard to the natural succession of events, his correspondence disposed without respect to the chronological arrangement. The fabricator of a piece, professing to come from his hand, must have consequently found himself destitute of the means of executing even a tolerable imitation. And every thing which presents

itself with such pretensions is answerable to this description, without any internal mark of Jerome's hand, and wholly destitute of manuscript authority. Let us suppose some fortunate sophisticator possessed of address to surmount the former difficulties, and by what lucky accident can the latter be conceived to be placed in his power? Let us suppose he has succeeded in the composition of the piece; and how are we to account for its general reception in the copies of the author's works? How account for its admission into the copies of the Bible? If this be considered impracticable with a text which favours the partialities of a Church, how is it to be reconciled with a piece which violates its prejudices? For that the disputed prologue has been attended with this consequence is obvious, from its effects on Martianay, Vallarsius, and Vitali, whom it has converted into oppugners, while they possessed the means of vindicating it from every objection. The reluctance which Cassiodorus manifests to enter into its doctrine respecting the arrangement of the epistles, sufficiently proves at how early a period the sense of the Western Church prevailed against it; and how widely this feeling has operated may be collected from the conduct of Dionysius Exiguus with respect to the Canons of the Council, from which the doctrine is adopted. In his translation of the acts of that Council, the sixtieth Canon, which is followed by the prologue, is wholly omitted: with what other object than in deference to the Latin Church, cannot be imagined. Yet over these prejudices the prologue has triumphed, and while the Canon is omitted in the collection of the Councils, it maintains its place in the Vulgate.

I have the honour to be, &c.

FRED. NOLAN,

BIBLICAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

(Continued.)

Exod. xxxv. 25.

"And all the women that were wise-headed did spin with their hands, &c."

Prov. xxxi. 10, 11. 13. 15. 19.

"Who can find a virtuous woman? for her price is far above rubies. The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her. She seeketh wool and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands. She riseth also, while it is yet night, and giveth meat to her household, and a portion to her maidens. She layeth her hands to the spindle, and her hands hold the distaff."

LET our virgin daughter, who is now marriageable, begin the weaving part along with the maids, that when carried home to her husband she may not disgrace us her parents. Besides, you ought to know that they who love spinning, and the business of the loom, are distinguished by their chaste and modest conduct.—*Alciphon's Epistles*, B. 3. Let. 41.

Full fifty handmaids form the household train,

Some turn the mill, or sift the golden grain;
Some ply the loom; their busy fingers move
Like poplar leaves when Zephyr fans the grove.

Not more renown'd the men of Scheiras
isle,

For sailing arts, and all the naval toil,
Than works of female skill, their women's
pride,

The flying shuttle thro' the threads to
guide:

Pallas to these her double gifts imparts,
Inventive genius, and industrious arts.

Odyssey, B. 7. L. 132.

Did not the Sun, thro' heav'n's wide azure
roll'd,

For three long years the royal fraud behold?
While she, laborious in delusion spread
The spacious loom, and mix'd the various
thread:

The work she ply'd: but studious of delay,
By night revers'd the labours of the day.
While thrice the Sun his annual journey
made,

The conscious lamp the midnight fraud
survey'd,

Unheard, unseen, three years her arts pre-
vail;

The fourth, her maid unfolds th' amazing
tale.

We saw, as unperceiv'd we took our stand,
The backward labours of her faithless hand.
Then urged, she perfects her illustrious
toils,

A wondrous monument of female wiles.

Odyssey, B. 2. L. 101.....117.

Ecclesiastes x. 1.

"Dead flies cause the ointment of the
Apothecary to send forth a stinking sa-
vour."

It is clear from this verse, that a preparation of dead flies in the composition of ointments was in use in the time of Solomon. The fly in most frequent use is the *Meloe Vesicatorius*. It is, however, supposed that the insect used by the ancients, and which is still constantly used by the Chinese for blisters is the *Meloe Cichorei* of Linnæus. Hasselquist mentions it as one of the insects met with in the Levant. As a further confirmation of the above text, it is worthy of observation that many of the insects of this genus have a power of exuding an oily liquid of a strong and often fetid smell.

Genesis xxx. 14.

"And Reuben went in the days of
the wheat harvest; and found mandrakes
in the field, and brought them unto his
mother Leah."

Solomon's Song vii. 13.

"The mandrakes give a smell."

Concerning this plant of which so many fabulous tales have been circulated, it may not be uninteresting to give Maritis's Account, Vol. 3. p. 146. of his travels.

He found them in May, which was the season of wheat harvest in Palestine, and the reader who consults his work will find a singular coincidence between the opinions of

the earliest ages as inferred from Genesis and of the modern Arabs respecting certain qualities ascribed to them.

"At the distance of a mile from the village of St. John we found among the hills, a great many plants of the mandragora or mandrake, which the Arabs call jabrohak. The greater part of them were covered with ripe fruit, which were of the size and colour of a small apple; they were exceedingly ruddy, and had a most agreeable odour. One of our Arabs thought to pay us a particular compliment by dismounting from his horse, and collecting several of these fruits, which he presented to us in order that we might eat them. We Europeans, however, did not find ourselves disposed to receive his favor, as we apprehended that they might have some narcotic quality, and be on that account prejudicial to the health. Our interpreters told us that the Arabs are remarkably fond of them, because they find their spirits elevated after they eat them; but I have often remarked, that their joy was for the most part succeeded by a deep melancholy. This plant is known also in Tuscany, and particularly in the Alps of Pistora. It grows in a low form like lettuce, to which its leaves have a resemblance,

except that they are of a dark green colour. The flowers are purple, and the root is for the most part forked.

Various fables are related of the mandragora, some of which are still common in the Levant, but as they are unworthy of notice, I shall only observe, that I was told in Palestine, that some people endeavouring to dig up this plant from the earth, were affected by so powerful a smell, that their heads became quite giddy. In Cyprus, I have often, in company with various friends, pulled up this plant, but I was never sensible of any such smell, nor experienced the least disorder in my head. I must here add, that in all my travels, I never saw this plant with fruit on it, except in the neighbourhood of the village of St. John. In Cyprus, where it abounds, I have every year seen it in flower, but never bearing fruit.

In the country of the Pawnawnees, a nation inhabiting some branches of the Messorie river, it is said that mandrakes are frequently found, a species of root resembling human beings of both sexes; and that these are more perfect than such as are discovered about the Nile in Nether Ethiopia.—*Caver's travels in North America*, vol. i. p. 118.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

SKETCHES OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

NO. VI.

THE Schools of learning which were instituted by Anglo-Saxon Prelates in the seventh century, will be tried by a very unfair test, if we compare them either with the academies of Greece and Rome, or with the colleges and universities of modern Europe. The teachers, and

the scholars, and the lessons were all so completely different, that justice cannot be done to any one of the three without adverting to the circumstances by which they are remarkably distinguished.

The missionaries who first preached Christianity to the Saxons, were not acquainted with the literature of the Augustan age; but lived at a time when every thing that was purely Roman, had been corrupted by repeated mixtures with the

Gothic invaders. Pope Gregory, the immediate patron and encourager of Austin, was no friend to classical learning, nor did he even adhere to the more imperfect models of the early Christian Fathers. As a sacred critic, he loved nothing so much as allegories: his eloquence consisted of forced conceits, and his character as a scholar as well as a Prelate, is not badly sketched by Foxe, who declares him to be as inferior to those who went before, as he was superior to most who followed him. The first circumstance therefore to be noted in the Anglo-Saxon schools, is, that their founders and teachers were falling rapidly into a state of barbarism and ignorance: their taste was vicious, their general knowledge was of the most confined and superficial character, and their reasoning powers were either totally neglected, or exerted after an absurd fashion upon absurdities and trifles.

The scholars were not placed in a more favourable situation; they had every thing to learn. The very language in which the lessons of the missionary were conveyed, was unknown to the pupils whom he came to teach. The habits and manners of the country were rude and uncivilized. The laws were simple, and depended in great measure upon the will and power of the ruler. War was the great business of men of rank and condition; and literature was only resorted to for the purpose of recording the valour of heroes, and stimulating their descendants to emulate or surpass them. The inhabitants of such a nation cannot have been well prepared for the reception of learning and science, and it is a matter of some surprise that they studied or profited at all.

The first thing they had to learn, as has already been observed, was language; and a language so entirely different from their vernacular tongue, that much pains must have been bestowed upon the acquisition of it. And when the Saxon youths

were masters of the corrupted Latin which was recommended to them, they used it in perusing a library, which with the single exception of the bible, was as ill calculated as possible to serve the cause of learning and letters. The grammarians of the later ages of Rome, the lawyers, and Church historians, and canonists, and commentators, were the writers with whom the more eminent endeavoured to become familiar; and to transcribe the opinions of earlier times, to extract and methodise the sentiments of St Augustin or some other father, was the height of critical ambition. If these facts are steadily borne in mind, the reader will easily estimate the real progress of learning among our Saxon fathers; and understanding why its amount was so inconsiderable, and so fruitless, he will not subscribe on the one hand to the opinions of the Romanist, or the Antiquarian who would persuade us that the seventh century was distinguished by the number of its philosophers and scholars. Nor on the other hand, will he be persuaded that the monks have no claim to our regard; or that in civilizing and instructing the barbarous inhabitants of this island, they performed an easy or unimportant task. The subject however will be discussed, and comprehended with more facility after some notice has been taken of the principal scholars of the time.

Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, is entitled to the first place. He was a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, and was consecrated at Rome, by Pope Vitalian, in the year of our Lord 668. Egbert, king of Kent had sent *Wigard* to Rome to receive ordination. But *Wigard* died of the plague which raged at that time in the city, and the Pope seized the opportunity of appointing Theodore to the vacant see. Not secure however of the orthodoxy, or perhaps the obedience of one who was born and bred in Greece, Vitalian or-

dered Adrian, a Roman monk to accompany Theodore into England, and to take care that he introduced no practices into the Saxon Church which were at variance with the Latin rules.

The first present which the new Primate conferred upon the country was a copious and splendid library of books, in the Greek and Latin languages. *Parker* especially mentions a *Homer* which he considered as still extant, and which was more beautiful than the best printed editions of his day. The works of Chrysostom and Josephus are spoken of in the same terms. Theodore is also believed to have founded a school at Cricklade in Wiltshire, where Greek was first taught to the Saxons; and from which place, in a subsequent age, Oxford received its original students. But what is more certain is, that the fame of Theodore's great learning procured him the acknowledged primacy of all England, an honour which none of his predecessors in the see of Canterbury had actually enjoyed—and so far was he from forgetting his obligations and allegiance to the Pope, that he introduced the Latin form of worship into all the churches and monasteries, and even proceeded to depose several of his suffragan bishops upon a charge of being uncanonically consecrated.

An undertaking more to his own credit, and to the advantage of the Church of England, was the assembly of two general Synods, the one at Hertford, and the other at Cliff, near Rochester. At the first the bishops and clergy pledged themselves generally to celebrate Easter according to the Roman cycle, to observe the ancient canons of the Church, to confine themselves each to his own peculiar district, to respect the rights and property of monasteries, to take measures for increasing the number of bishops and clergy, to prohibit their converts from marrying more than one wife,

or from divorcing her for any cause except adultery; and that no bishop should claim individual superiority over his brethren, but all be content to rank according to the date of their consecrations. The second Synod was principally occupied with the subject of the Trinity, respecting which new heresies were now springing up in the East. The Saxons, under the direction of Theodore, professed their faith in the Catholic doctrine, as it is now received, and adopted the confessions and resolutions of the five general councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and Constantinople the Second. And the acts of this Synod were immediately transmitted to Rome, by John, Abbot of St. Martin's, and Precentor of St. Peter's. This John was the most celebrated church musician of his age, and it is from his arrival that we may date the introduction of the Latin Cathedral service into England. Much importance was then attached to the art of singing or chaunting, and John and the pupils whom he instructed, are always mentioned with the greatest respect by Bede and other early writers.

Theodore died in the year 690, and expressed his sincere contrition for the harshness with which he had treated Wilfrid and other bishops. His principal work was *The Penitential*, the idea of which he borrowed from the Greek writers, and was the first to introduce into the West of Europe. He has since had many imitators. He drew up likewise some extracts from the Canons and other ecclesiastical writings; and whatever may be thought of the extent of his learning, or his genius, it must be admitted that in his person the Pope had the honour of sending us our first instructor in ancient literature, as he had previously in the person of Austin sent our first teacher of Christianity. The success in both cases may have been inconsiderable, but the primary difficulty was overcome, and the found-

dation was solidly and securely laid.

The next in rank to Theodore among the early English sages was *Aldhelm*, a Saxon of noble birth, who was committed in his youth to the care of Adrian, and made an extraordinary proficiency in the learning of those days. He studied philosophy in the monastery of *Meldun* (afterwards Malmesbury) which had been recently founded by a Scotchman named Meildun, and his talents were duly estimated both by his countrymen and by foreigners. William of Malmesbury tells us that Aldhelm was a good writer and a poet in his native tongue, that the common people were delighted and improved by his recitations, and that at the same time, he was respectfully consulted by the more eminent scholars of other countries; especially *Arcivilus*, a Scotch prince, who submitted his compositions to Aldhelm, *ut perfecti ingenii limâ craderetur scabredo Scotica*. He was a great master of the Roman law; and excelled also in Grammar, astronomy, music, and metre. He wrote a defence of the Roman mode of celebrating Easter; and three books, one in prose, and two in verse *De virginitatis laude*. There are extant also, says Malmesbury, a thousand verses of his *de ænigmatibus*, divided into ten chapters: the first and last letters of the preface to each chapter forming this verse: Aldhelmus cecinit millenis versibus odas. He also composed treatises upon the number seven, upon brotherly love, and upon various grammatical and poetical niceties. Malmesbury gives the following curious account of his style. "Sermones ejus minus infundunt hilaritatis quam vellent ii qui rerum incuriosi verba trutinant; judices importuni qui nesciant quod secundum mores gentium varientur modi dictaminum. Demque Græci involute, Romani splendide, Angli pompaticè dictare solent. Id in omnibus antiquis cartis, est animadvertere, quantum quibusdam verbis ab-

strusis ex Græco petitis delectentur. Moderatius tamen se agit Aldhelmus nec nisi perraro et necessario verba ponit exotica. Allegat catholicos sensus sermo facundus, violentissimas assertiones exornat color rhetoricus. Quem si perfecte legeris et ex acumine Græcum putabis, et ex nitore Romanum jurabis et ex pompâ Anglum intelliges." The charge of speaking *pompatically* is fully borne out by the quotations with which Malmesbury has furnished us—but when we remember the situation of the Saxons before the coming of Austin, there is more reason to wonder that Aldhelm could write at all, than that his erudition was not adorned by simplicity and good taste. He died in the year 709, having been Abbott of Malmesbury for thirty-four years, and Bishop of Sherborne or Salisbury for five. It is reported that he was consecrated at Rome; and that he took that opportunity of remonstrating with the Pope upon his luxurious manner of living.

The last and the greatest of the worthies now to be mentioned is Bede, whose Ecclesiastical History is the most precious relic that has descended from his time to ours, and whose character appears to have been as blameless as any upon record.

He was born in 672, near the mouth of the river Tine; was educated in the monastery of St. Peter, at Weremouth; and is not known to have travelled beyond the precincts of that immediate neighbourhood. His life, therefore, is particularly barren of incidents; but the careful observer of past events will find ample food for curiosity and speculation in remembering that in that obscure corner of the world, Bede made himself master of all the learning of Greece and Rome, became intimately acquainted with the Fathers of the Church, and an adept in the most abstruse sciences, while at the same time he set his contemporaries an example of unblemished purity and piety, and composed little less

than an hundred volumes for their instruction. The patient, persevering industry which produced such effects is of itself entitled to the highest praise, and the success of the monastic system, and the excessive influence which was subsequently obtained by the ecclesiastical order, are accounted for in a satisfactory manner by the virtues and attainments of these primitive monks. What invaluable assistance must have been afforded to our early legislators and judges by such men as Aldhelm and Bede. What authority must they have obtained over the uninformed minds of the Saxons by their virtuous, although to a certain extent misapplied, self-denial, and their devoted adherence to the cloister which they raised and adorned. We may borrow the words of the poet in a recently published work, and say, that Bede and his associates afford a profitable lesson to all succeeding ages of the Church.

"But what if one, through grove or flow'ry mead,

Indulging thus at will the creeping feet
Of a voluptuous indolence, should meet
The hovering shade of venerable Bede,
The saint, the scholar, from a circle freed
Of toil stupendous, in a hallowed seat
Of learning where he heard the billows beat

On a wild coast—rough monitors to feed
Perpetual industry. Sublime Recluse!
The recreant soul that dares to shun the debt

Imposed on human kind, must first forget
Thy diligence, thy unrelaxing use
Of a long life, and in the hour of death
The last dear service of thy parting breath*."

Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Sketches, xxiii.

It is certain however, that no great effect was produced upon the body of the people, either by Monkish industry, or Monkish talent. A servile reliance upon the decisions of preceding writers, a disposition to cultivate the memory in preference to the understanding, and a habit of addressing very ignorant men, may

explain the inconsistencies of the wise, and teach us why the greater part continued in their folly. For instance, Bede's History contains a very perspicuous narrative of the events which he undertakes to describe—and his observations upon the character and conduct of his principal personages, are not more remarkable for the love of virtue and honour than for the practical good sense which they exhibit. Yet the moment that he enters upon the chapter of miracles and mysteries, he talks the most unqualified nonsense. Would not this have been prevented by mixing more freely with the world, and is it not obvious that the absurdities which could subjugate the understanding of a Bede, would take a still stronger hold of the common herd of Monks? Great part of their time was consumed in learning by heart and repeating the ritual of the Church of Rome. As soon as they were themselves perfected in the task, they devoted a second portion of their lives to the initiation of their younger brethren into the same secrets; and lessons which would have

† An instance of this may be found in Bede's History, V. 22. He gives and extolls a long letter from Ceolfrid, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Peter and Paul, respecting the two great controversies of that age, the time of keeping Easter, and the form of the clerical tonsure. On the former Ceolfrid argues with great acuteness from the Bible, and the astronomical tables, but concludes by offering a mystical proof—and it is this—By the British and Scotch computation it will occasionally happen that Easter is kept before the Equinoctial full moon—and as this full moon is a type of Christ, the heretics, who do not wait for its appearance, must believe that they might have been justified before or without Christ's coming, and may now be saved before or without preventing grace!! The tonsure is settled in the same manner—For St. Peter shaved his head in a circular form, and exhibited a complete crown, an emblem of true righteousness and heavenly joy. But Simon Magus was the author of the semi-circular fashion, and it is a fit representation of his hypocrisy and destruction.

Z z 2

* He expired in the act of concluding a translation of St. John's Gospel.

sufficed for the improvement of a whole kingdom were confined within the precincts of a single convent. They took little or no part in worldly affairs, and they were imperfectly acquainted with human nature. At times they found it convenient to stop the mouth of an objector by a sophistical argument or a fabricated miracle—and eventually they deceived not only others but themselves. The savage who saw and admired the sanctity of their manners, was satisfied with any reason they condescended to adduce; and the perpetual warfare in which he was engaged prevented him from acquiring knowledge enough to de-

tect the imposture. The conversion of the Saxons was still incomplete when the Danish invasion commenced. One distraction succeeded another for upwards of three centuries. To the repeated assaults of the barbarians by which this age of the world was distinguished, the Monks both in Britain and on the Continent opposed a feeble and wavering but unquenched light. With the Gospel in their hand, they might have done more—but much that was important they did perform; they kept alive a spark of truth and science, and enabled their more fortunate successors to kindle the flame.

MISCELLANEOUS.

To the Editor of the Remembrancer.

SIR,

AMONG the ebullitions of exaggerated zeal, there is one, which, as far as I recollect, has not been noticed in the pages of your excellent Miscellany. I allude to the practice prevalent among enthusiastic travellers, of showering down religious tracts from their carriage windows on the wondering peasants or labourers, who may be engaged in their occupations by the road side, as the whirling equipage rolls along. Such an out-pouring of "divinity most rare," was lately noticed in my neighbourhood, and one of the papers, which on this occasion was wafted from a coroneted coach, amidst a groupe of masons and labourers has been put into my hands.

"Cast thy bread upon the waters, for thou shalt find it after many days," is an injunction which we should all obey; and which has not been in vain inculcated on the Christians of our age. But then it behoves us to enquire into the quality of the bread which is thus cast; whether it be nutritive, unadulterated, wholesome food; or whether

it be crude, indigestible, rather fitted to cause a surfeit, than to preserve or promote the general health.

The paper before me is entitled "Friendly Advice to all whom it may concern," and printed for the Religious Tract Society, being numbered No. 65. An earnest and serious exhortation to faith in Christ is couched in strong and impressive language. Repentance is then mentioned, and the following passage succeeds. "In short, your whole heart must be changed; you must become quite a *new creature*; you must be *born again*. You have hitherto loved the world, self, and sin; now you must love God, his word, commandment, house, and ordinances. You have hitherto neglected your soul; now you must be ever looking to Christ for pardon, grace and glory. Thus, "except you be born again, you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." You are not to suppose that you are born again in baptism: baptism is an outward work upon the body, performed by man; the new birth is an inward work upon the soul, wrought by the Spirit of God. Oh! do not

rest till you have got some pious Christian to instruct you further in the nature of the new birth. When you understand the true nature of every man who is born into the world, as set forth (Rom. iii.) you will be better able to see the necessity and benefit of the new birth, spoken of in John iii.

Here we find the old confusion of terms; regeneration and renovation interchangeably misrepresented; the sacrament of baptism degraded into a mere ceremony; the new birth predicated of some vague and varying operation of the Spirit, undefined as to time, place, or character. That there are many serious and thinking persons who hold these opinions, is but too true; but, I would ask, are the itinerating dispensers of these tracts, in which they are set forth,—are those, who scatter these Sybilline leaves with indiscriminating eagerness, and fond self-complacency,—are they quite sure that they are disseminating the true doctrine, and in the true way? Have they so minutely weighed the conflicting arguments on these mysterious and intricate points, as confidently to take their stand on ground not occupied by the Sages of our Church, and to range themselves under the guidance of the new lights? I cannot but figure to myself the tract in question falling into the hands of some well-intentioned but weakly judging peasant or handicraftsman. Full of the adventure, which placed him in possession of the New Homily, he sits down to con it over, when he returns from his labour to his cottage fire-side. He is pleased with the earnestness of the address, led captive by the kindness of heart manifested in the liberal dispersion of these little good books, and prone to believe what he finds in print, and what is largely interspersed with references to Holy Writ. Bap-

tism and the new birth have, indeed, been differently represented to him in the sermons of his Minister: but then the Parson is an old-fashioned man, and the treasured tract, which occupies his attention, coming recommended by so much, that attracts the imagination, does not refer the reader to the "discreet and learned Minister of God's Word," nor to the Common Prayer Book, as the proper expositor and commentary on the texts which are cited. Were the cottager, indeed, to consult his Prayer Book, the whole tenor of the baptismal service would be found in opposition to the brief but authoritative assertions as to baptism and the new birth quoted above. But the chances are greatly against a reference either to the Common Prayer Book or the Parish Priest: the tract points to "some pious Christian," and every neighbourhood affords many "reformers" in religion, who would strive to effect a "radical" change in the opinions of the uninitiated, whenever an opportunity of biasing their minds or inculcating peculiar doctrines may occur.

Once again, then, I would ask, is it right or considerate to sow by the way-side such seed as may spring up into the weeds of dissatisfaction, misplaced enthusiasm, or dissent? In plainer language, is it excusable to intrude into the authorized Minister's province, and there by possibility incline the lower classes first to doubt the soundness of the doctrine of their Pastor; then to deviate into rash and crude speculations, and at last to end in forsaking the Church of their forefathers, and the sound tenets in which they have been brought up?

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

CLER. GLOC.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Summary of Christian Faith and Practice, confirmed by Reference to the Text of Holy Scripture; compared with the Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies of the Church of England; and illustrated by Extracts from the chief of those Works, which received the Sanction of Publick Authority, from the Time of the Reformation, to the Final Revision of the Established Formularies. By the Rev. E. J. Burrow, D.D. F.R.S. and F.L.S. 3 vols. Rivingtons.

THE mind of a religious Christian is never more usefully or delightfully employed, than in surveying the solid foundations of his faith, as restored to him at the Reformation, and in observing how all the parts fitly joined together, contribute to the stability, consistency, and perfection of the whole. No dissonance nor contrariety appears in its materials or its construction, no *untimpered mortar*, nor fortuitous combination. All is the result of a well-digested plan, and well-contrived materials, derived immediately from the fountains of Truth, and wrought by workmen who laboured under their immediate guidance. Thus it is, that our Jerusalem is built as a city that is at unity in itself, all the parts in exact correspondence with each other, that the more accurately her foundations *which are on the Holy Hills* are examined, however *well* the friend or the enemy *mark her bulwarks*, the more perfect they appear, and that an admirable consistency and uniformity of design are visible, which declare that its builder and maker, is God. The doctrines of the Liturgy, the Articles, and the Homilies, are in perfect unison amongst themselves, and their truth is confirmed by references to every part of that great original on which they are founded.

The author of this work informs us that his attention having not long since been directed to a close investigation of the principles of the Reformers of the Church of England, and of the state of public opinion relative to certain points of theological inquiry, at the different dates, subsequent to the Reformation, which form so many eras in the ecclesiastical history of the kingdom, he was desirous to impart to others the satisfaction and instruction he had himself received, in observing the perfect unanimity, which prevails between those reverend martyrs, by whose judicious, persevering, and well-expended labour, the foundation of the Protestant Church was actually laid, and their eminently learned and pious followers, who perfected the plan, and raised the present goodly superstructure. The principles and opinions of these great and exemplary men, he proceeded to compare with the one unerring standard of Truth, the Holy Scriptures, and with the Doctrines of the Liturgy. With these materials before him, he began to exceed his original intention. Having never met with any book that afforded a connected and compendious view of Christian Faith and Practice upon the principles of the English Church, resembling the work put forth by authority in the Church of Scotland, comprehending a Confession of Faith, a larger and shorter Catechism, directions for public and family worship, and a form of Church Government; such a work had frequently appeared to him a great desideratum, and to supply that deficiency is the object of the present undertaking.

"The author is not vain enough to flatter himself, that he has so far succeeded according to his wishes, as to have his labours considered of any great importance to his clerical brethren, but it is his wish that his Compendium may not be

altogether useless, even to them as a book of reference. They will find at once the greater part of the passages of Scripture, relating to each particular head of doctrine, arranged together; they will find all the ecclesiastical authorities which they can require for common purposes; they will find much, very much to admire in the forcible simple phraseology of the early Catechists.

"His object has been not to discuss, but to state concisely what the author believes to be the right interpretation of the Church of England, as it is to be learned from a comparison of her authorized formularies, and the public writings of her founders, with the Standard of Scripture, to which she desires to be referred: and in the next place to furnish the student in Divinity with a concentrated digest of much that is necessary for him to acquire before he is invested with the sacred functions of the minister of Christ, which yet is scattered widely through works not always accessible to this class of readers; and he hopes that the many extracts he has made from the Scriptures, the Liturgy, and the works of the reformers, may form an useful manual, and save much time and trouble to those whose every moment ought to be held most precious; that it may give them a clear connected view of all the great doctrines of our holy faith, that it may enable them to observe in the parallel writings of men who have been in their day the light and ornaments of their profession, the same tone of pure exalted piety, the same anxious zeal in establishing the firm principles of evangelical morality, and the same spirit of Christian love by which the English Church is so eminently distinguished.

"Another object has been to compile such an explanation of essential truths as may be edifying to the less educated classes of society. They are, and ever must be, the subjects of peculiar interest and vigilance to the conscientious parish priest; but no instructions either from the pulpit or in private, can be so comprehensive as to embrace all things which may be considered as matters of great moment amongst the unlearned in the present day. If, however, their legitimate teachers have not opportunity to impart all the required information upon doctrinal, and even speculative questions, they will assuredly meet with some one who perhaps is little qualified for the office, to satisfy their thirst for theological knowledge, according to his ideas of sacred truth—ideas, often much at variance with

the declarations of the Church of England. It may be useful to put into the hands of such persons some book which shall shew them, what the Church really does hold as truth, and what she does not acknowledge."

The following is the order which Dr. B. has observed in the arrangement of his materials. A distinct chapter is appropriated to every prominent point of doctrine, according to the series suggested by the successive articles of the Apostles' Creed, the Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer. In each of these chapters, stands first the original matter; this is followed by texts from Scripture confirming and authorizing it, by extracts from the Book of Common Prayer, by one or more of the Thirty-nine Articles, and by notices from the two books of Homilies: to these succeed quotations from works of minor authority, but still of great value as establishing the true interpretation of Scripture, and explaining and corroborating the articles of religion. These are arranged in the chronological order in which they were published; and consist of "The Sum and Content of the Holy Scripture" prefixed to some of the earliest authorized Bibles, after the work of reformation had commenced in this kingdom; a preface to the Bible by Archbishop Cranmer, a Catechism edited by Cranmer, Edward the Sixth's Catechism, Jewell's Apology, a Preface to the Bible, by Archbishop Parker, Nowell's Catechism, and lastly, a work intitled, "*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, &c.*"

Such of our readers as have not met with any of these curious documents, may be pleased with our author's account of them.

"THE SUM AND CONTENT OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE, was prefixed to some of the early English Translations of the Bible, was revised by Cranmer, bore his name, and was used in churches by authority, in the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth. This Bible may be considered as one of the foundation-stones of the re-

formation, being the first publicly used by royal authority, and free from the errors of Popery, which were not expunged from other works at the same period. This short treatise, and the *Preface* or *Prologue* to the Bible, which latter first appeared in 1540, have been quoted as curious specimens of the progress which had been made in the promulgation of the Protestant Faith, under Henry's wavering auspices.

"CRANMER'S CATECHISM, or 'A Shorte Introduction into Christian Religion, for the singuler Commoditie, and Proffyte of Children and young People, set forth by the Mooste Reverende Father in God, Thomas, &c.' was printed in 1548, and though not acknowledged by any publick act of the legislature, claims every attention on account of its editor, its patron, and not less of its own merit. Plain and explanatory, it is not only calculated to convey the rudiments of Christianity to the young and uneducated, but to furnish much valuable information to the theological student. The custom which formerly obtained of uniting the two first Commandments, and dividing the last into two is preserved.

"EDWARD THE SIXTH'S CATECHISME, or 'Playne Instruction, conteynynge the Summe of Christian Learninge, sett fourth by the King's Maiesties Authoritie, for all Scholemaisters to teach,' received the sanction of Convocation, at the same time (in 1552) with the Forty-two Articles, and in 1553, was published with them by the Royal Authority, and having been assented to by the Convocation, is carefully to be perused by the inquirer into the state of religious opinion at the termination of Edward's reign. It is brief, but clear and forcible in its expositions, and is therefore every way fitted for the use made of it in these volumes.

"JEWELL'S APOLOGY, intitled in the original Latin, '*Apologia Ecclesie Anglicane, Authore Joanna Juellio, Episcopo Sarisburiensi*,' was published in 1562, by the Queen's authority, and with the sanction of the Convocation; and it soon acquired such great celebrity as to be considered the national confession of faith.

"ARCHBISHOP PARKER'S PREFACES, were prefixed to the Old and New Testaments in that famous edition, published in 1568, which is called the Bishop's Bible. This version of the Scriptures, and the treatises attached to it, cannot but be regarded with great interest, when it is recollected that about the time of its publication, there was a greater dissonance of

opinion in some most important questions, than perhaps at any other, and that there was a constant struggle to establish as the sense of the Church of England, tenets incompatible with the views of the first reformers.

"About the same time came forth, (1570) NOWELL'S CATECHISM, Dean of St. Paul's, written as he asserts in his address to the Archbishops and Bishops, with not less careful attention to the Latinity, than to the doctrine, in order that the youth might obtain an acquaintance with pure classical language, as well from books of Christian piety, as from the profane, fictitious, sometimes impious and impure fables of the poets.

"The last work referred to, is intitled 'REFORMATIA LEGUM ECCLESIASTICARUM, ex autoritate primum Regis Henrici 8. inchoata; Deinde per Regem Edwardum 6. protracta, adhaetaque in hunc modum, atque nunc ad pleniorum ipsarum reformationem in lucem adita, 1571.' Much presumptive authority, but no positive sanction, either of the Legislature, or of the Church, is to be ascribed to this important compilation, nor is it to be doubted, that the statutes of which it consists, would have passed into laws, if the life of the king (Edward) had been spared a little longer."

These are 52 in number, and embrace equally subjects of doctrine, ecclesiastical laws, and church discipline.

Dr. B. adds, as a consummation to his account of these works of the reformers, an English version of that great document from which it is easy to trace not only the substance, but the very words, of many of our Articles of Faith, the CONFESSION OF AUGSBURG; the first in point of date, and perhaps too the first in excellence, of all the Protestant Confessions that appeared between 1530, and 1586. Our own reformers never lost sight of the sound principles in which it was composed, while engaged in the arduous task of preparing a national Confession for the Church of England.

This work which is likewise denominated the *Augustan* Confession was presented to the Emperor Charles V. at the memorable Diet

of Augsburg, by the noble Protestants of Germany, in 1530. It consists of 21 articles, evidently the prototypes of those, and of the Canons, which were adopted for the Church of England.

The first of the three volumes before us, is divided into two parts; of which, the former consists of seven chapters: 1. Of Religion and the Scriptures; 2. Of the Nature and Attributes of God; 3. Of the Trinity; 4. Of God the Father; 5. Of Creation; 6. Of Providence; 7. Of the Fall of Man and Original Sin. The latter, of six; 1. Of the Covenant of Grace; 2. Of Jesus Christ the Son of God; 3. Of the Incarnation of Christ; 4. Of the Names and Offices of Christ; 5. Of the Humiliation of Christ; 6. Of the Exaltation of Christ.

The second volume is also divided into two parts, the former of which consists of eleven chapters: 1. Of the Holy Ghost; 2. Of Predestination, Election, and Reprobation; 3. Of Vocation; 4. Of the Gospel; 5. Of Faith; 6. Of Justification; 7. Of Adoption; 8. Of Sanctification; 9. Of Good Works; 10. Of Repentance; 11. Of Perseverance. The latter, of four; 1. Of the Church; 2. Of the Sacraments; 3. Of Baptism, Regeneration, and Renovation; 4. Of the Lord's Supper. The third volume is divided into three parts, the first of which consists of eleven chapters: 1. Of the Moral Law, and the remaining ten of the Commandments in succession; the second, of two; 1. Of Prayer; 2. Of the Form of Prayer; and the third, likewise of two; 1. Of the Resurrection and Last Judgment; 2. Of Eternal Life.

Each of these subjects is discussed at such considerable length, that if we were to admit one entire article, we must exclude all mention of the rest. We shall therefore give an abbreviated extract from each volume, as a fair specimen of Dr. B.'s plan and its execution, selecting from the first, his

discourse on the *Humiliation of Christ*, and the subsequent proofs and corroborations.

"1. *The state of humiliation* in which it pleased the Eternal Son of the Most High to effect the redemption of the fallen race of Adam, commenced doubtless with his Incarnation. All the circumstances of his life, some of which were most painful and distressing, exhibited the absolute submission which He had imposed on himself, as necessary to the performance of the mighty work he had undertaken; and it appears that from the Manger to the Cross, every incident of his life concurred, either directly or indirectly, to fill up the measure of his afflictions.

"2. As the ministry of our Lord drew towards its close, he went up for the last time to Jerusalem, at the Feast of the Passover. At his entry into the Holy City on this occasion, he allowed himself to be greeted as a sovereign. Still the humble style and unostentatious retinue of the meek and lowly Jesus, were sufficient evidence that his kingdom was not of this world, and that it was the triumph of a spiritual, and not a temporal potentate. The first act of authority which he exercised, was to drive from the Court of the Temple those who had dared to dishonour and defile it.

"3. The first stage of his humiliation may here be supposed to end; and the second, that of more intolerable suffering, and far deeper degradation, to begin. Having celebrated the Passover with his disciples, he went into the Garden of Gethsemane, where the first scene of his *Passion* was completed. His agony of soul was such as to produce the most violent effect on his corporeal frame, even so that the blood forcing itself through the distended veins, mingled with the sweat which fell in large drops from his throbbing brow. This *Passion* of our Redeemer, as it proved that he was subject to corporeal infirmities and pains, to mental anguish, grief, and apprehensions, affords us assurance that he is 'touched with the feeling of our infirmities.'

"4. Betrayed by Judas, he was conducted to the palace of the High Priest, and declared to be guilty of blasphemy, in asserting himself to be the Son of God. The Jews were not permitted, in consequence of their subjection to the Romans, to put any man to death. Jesus was therefore sent to Pontius Pilate the Roman Procurator, who ordered him to be scourged, to be arrayed in the ensigns of

mock majesty, and to be crucified. At length, he was led forth, bearing his cross, so long as his tender frame could sustain it, to the Hill of Calvary. There he underwent the most painful and ignominious death which even the Roman law permitted. So lingering and cruel was the death by crucifixion, that the Romans inflicted it only on the vilest malefactors. Having endured for six hours, from nine o'clock in the morning till three in the afternoon, the ineffable torments of mind and body, to so great an extreme was he depressed by submission to the penal wrath of his heavenly Father as to exclaim 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' His precious death was announced by supernatural phenomena, by the restoration to life of 'certain bodies of saints which slept,' and by the rending of the great veil of the temple.

"5. In order that the body of Jesus might not remain on the cross during the ensuing sabbath, the Jews begged of Pilate that it might be taken down as soon as it was ascertained that he was dead. A soldier pierced the side of Jesus with a spear, and from the wound flowed blood and water, physically demonstrating that death had taken place. Joseph of Arimathea, with Nicodemus, having requested the body, wrapped it in fine linen and spices, according to the custom of the richer Jews, and *laid it in his own sepulchre*, newly hewn out of a rock. A great stone closed the entrance to the tomb, and the Jews set a watch to prevent the access of any person to the spot. The burial was not permitted, till Pilate had been convinced that he was really dead, and had thus afforded unquestionable evidence of this most important fact.

"6. The soul of Jesus Christ, thus separated from his mortal body, *descended into hell*, the invisible place of departed spirits."

Of these facts and all the circumstances attending them, follow first the proofs from *Scripture*, in sections numerically referring to the above, copiously and industriously collected from all parts of the Old and New Testament; secondly, extracts from the Book of Common Prayer, viz.

"**MORNING PRAYER. Te Deum.** When thou hast overcome the sharpness of death, thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers.

"We therefore pray thee, help thy ser-

vants whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious blood, &c.

"**APOSTLES' CREED.** I believe ... in Jesus Christ ... who ... suffered under Pontius Pilate was crucified, dead, and buried; He descended into Hell, &c.

"**CREED OF ST. ATHANASIUS.** For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ;

"Who suffered for our salvation, descended into Hell, &c.

"**LITANY.** By thy Baptism, Fasting, and Temptation.

"By thine Agony and bloody sweat; by thy Cross and Passion, by thy precious Death and Burial, &c."

From the Collects for the first Sunday in Advent, and in Lent, &c. the Nicene Creed, and sundry other parts of the Communion Service, from the **PUBLIC BAPTISM OF INFANTS**, the **CATECHISM**, and **VISITATION OF THE SICK**: 3dly, from the Thirty-nine Articles, II. and III.; 4thly, from three of the Homilies which treat of the Misery of Mankind, their Salvation, and of the Passion; 5thly, from the **SUM AND CONTENT OF HOLY SCRIPTURE**, viz.

"In the New Testament therefore it is most evidently declared that Jesus Christ, the true Lamb and Host is come, to reconcile us to the Father, &c."

Sixthly, from Cranmer's Catechism, viz.

"For seeing that Christ was that most innocent lamb, that never was blotted with any spot of sin, and yet he suffered for us as a sinner, it is evident hereby that he died not for himself, but took upon him our sins, and bore for us the burden which we should have borne."

Seventhly, from *King Edward the Sixth's Catechism*, from which we find it more difficult to extract a specimen than any other part of the work, so quaint and obsolete are the forms of expression between the *Master* and the *Scholar*, though doubtless the doctrine be sound and blameless.

"*Master.* All these foundations that thou hast said are most true. Now, therefore, let us go forward to those his doings,

wherein lieth our salvation and conquest, against that old serpent.

"*Scholar.* It shall be done, good master. After that Christ Jesus had delivered in charge to his apostles, that most joyful, and in all points heavenly doctrine, the Gospel, which in Greek is called *Euangelion*, in English, good tidings, at length was he sore scourged, mocked with pointing, scorning, and spitting in his face: last of all, his hands and feet bored through with nails, and he fastened to a cross, &c."

Eighthly, from JEWELL'S APOLOGY FOR THE CHURCH, viz.

"We say that man is born and does live in sin, and that no man can truly say his heart is clean, that no mortal can be justified in the sight of God by his own deserts, and therefore our only refuge and safety is in the mercy of God the Father by Jesus Christ, and in the assuring ourselves, that he has pacified all things by the blood of his cross. Now, if there be any who think that this sacrifice is not sufficient, let us go and find out a better. But as for us, because we know this is the only sacrifice, we are contented with it alone, nor do we expect any other; and because it was only once to be offered, we do not enjoin the repetition of it; and because it was full, and in all its members and parts perfect, we do not substitute to it the perpetual successions of our own sacrifices."

It is impossible to read this last sentence, without observing its direct denial of the perpetual sacrifice in the mass.

Ninthly, from NOWELL'S CATECHISM, which likewise consists of a Dialogue between a Master and Student; and lastly, from the REFORMATIO LEGUM, in which occurs a chapter *Of the Death or Sleep of Souls, and of the Resurrection*, thus commented on.

"Some impiously philosophize, that the souls of men departing this life, when once they have left the body, are either immersed in sleep, or return to nothing, till the day of the last judgment, and they will be aroused from sleep, or rise from death with their own bodies.... For in like manner as Jesus Christ was recalled to life in an entire, true, and perfect body, nor did his soul perish or fall asleep; so we who are members of Christ live in the

soul after death, but following our head shall rise again with souls and bodies at the last judgment."

The next specimen we shall offer is from the second volume. But we must considerably abbreviate it, presenting only the leading subjects of the several sections. It is intitled, *On the Sacraments.*

"1. The word *Sacrament*, meaning originally an oath of allegiance, is now restricted to certain consecrated matter ordained by our Saviour to be an outward visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace. 2. *Sacraments are the signs and seals of grace.* 3. They are the signs and seals of the New Covenant, and memorials both to God and man, by which each signifies his adherence to his part of the covenant established; a mutual act, by which, God binds himself to impart salutary grace, and man promises to fulfil the terms on which it is conferred. Thus are God and man united by a mutual pledge! 4. *Sacraments are outward marks, by which Christians are distinguished from all who are not members of Christ's body.* 5. *It is necessary to a Christian Sacrament that it should be ordained by Christ himself.* 6. Christ has also appointed the persons by whom the Sacraments are to be administered, to those who are duly ordained to preach the word, the ministers of the Gospel. 7. *The first of the two parts of which a Sacrament consists, is the outward visible sign.* 8. *The second part is the spiritual grace, or the thing signified.* 9. The thing signified is not inherent in the sign: it is only relative and sacramental, the sign being the object of the senses, and the thing signified, of faith. 10. *The outward sign is accompanied by the inward grace, but is not the efficient cause of it.* 11. *The dispositions necessary to the due reception of the Sacraments are Faith and Repentance.* To those who do not rightly use them, the Sacraments are vain and fruitless. 12. The Church of England acknowledges only two Sacraments, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper."

"Confirmatory Texts from Scripture."

"A portion of the Catechism."

"The 25th and 26th of the Thirty-nine Articles."

"The Ninth Homily."

"KING EDWARD THE SIXTH'S CATECHISM, in which the Sacraments are defined to be 'certain customary, reverent doings and ceremonies ordained by Christ

that by them he might put us in remembrance of his benefits, &c.'"

"JEWELL'S APOLOGY OF THE CHURCH, in which they are called 'sacred signs and ceremonies, which Christ commanded us to use, that he might thereby represent to our eyes the mysteries of our salvation.'"

"NOWELL'S CATECHISM, which describes them to be 'an outward testifying of God's good will and bountifulness towards us, through Christ, by a visible sign, representing an invisible and spiritual grace.' And the

"REFORMATIO LEGUM, which affirms that 'Great is their thoughtlessness, who so undervalue the Sacraments, that they wish them to be considered as mere naked signs and external tokens only, by which the religion of Christians may be known from others. A Sacrament is a visible sign instituted by God, by which the grace derived to us from the promises and merits of Christ, and the remission of sins set forth in these promises, are sealed.'"

Our last specimen is from the third volume, the article

"OF THE MORAL LAW. 1. What is meant by the Divine Laws in general. 2. It is necessary to distinguish those precepts which are peculiarly Mosaic from those which belong to the Law of Nature. 3. The Mosaic Laws of three kinds, Moral, Ceremonial, and Judicial. 4. Signification of the word Decalogue. 5. The Decalogue obligatory on all Christians. 6. Certain Rules in interpreting the Decalogue. 7. Tables of the Law. 8. Substance of the Ten Commandments."

This is followed as before, by correspondent sections, containing extracts of confirmation from every part of Scripture, from the Book of Common Prayer, from the Commandments, the Baptism of Infants, the Catechism, the Seventh Article, the Fifth Homily, Cranmer's, Edward the Sixth's, and Nowell's Catechisms.

The idea of this work is certainly new. We have never met with such an accumulation of authorities, sacred and secular, collected in so small a compass, confirming and elucidating the original doctrines. It must therefore, of course, be highly useful to the young student

who is preparing himself for the sacred office, as well as to those who have entered the threshold, and wish to look back upon, and contemplate the sacred bases of their Faith, and the coincidence of their established formularies, with the doctrines of our immortal reformers, who drew from the living fountains their streams of health, unmixed with the extraneous matter which had for so many ages polluted it.

Neither must the *Introduction* pass without our commendation. To those who would obtain a correct knowledge of the gradual steps by which the Reformation was accomplished, from its earliest dawn under the *wavering auspices* of Henry VIII., to its completion under Elizabeth, together with much biblical information on the same subject, the *Introduction* will prove a valuable compendium.

But a principal merit of this work, consists in the excellence of its author's intentions.

"He who writes on common topics, has at stake his character for literary attainment or scientific research,—he has to dread the lash of criticism, which may justly, perhaps, inflict a severe punishment for ignorance, or for folly and presumption, in attempting to teach to others that with which he himself is unacquainted,—he has to apprehend the mortification of observing, that his volumes mildew on the shelf, unheeded or thrown aside by those for whose improvement they were designed. In addition to these causes for anxiety, a heavy burthen is laid on him who trusts himself to handle religious subjects: he has a much more arduous cause before him, in proportion as the weight of his responsibility is incomparably greater; as his freedom is more fettered; as the path is often intricate and dark, and as the danger of deviating from the one right but narrow way, is rendered much more formidable, by the chance of drawing others with him into perplexity and peril. He writes not for the entertainment, but for the instruction of his fellow-creatures; and assumes, therefore, in the very act, that he has ability to teach them. He awaits the sentence not only of man, but of God; not only of those

who are his superiors in human learning but of the Supreme Being. If he lightly take in hand to explain the sacred text of the word of God, to exhort his brethren, to lay down the principles of sound doctrine and good conduct, without having thoroughly informed himself of all that is necessary, he is not only blameable, but he incurs no small risk of being accounted touchingly presumptuous in venturing to touch high and holy things without becoming preparation, in daring to sully their purity with unconsecrated hands. But more than this, he makes himself answerable for an injury to the present and eternal peace of his fellow-creatures, which through want of information that he ought to have acquired, and of caution that he ought to have exercised, he may be instrumental in producing.

"Under the influence of feelings arising naturally out of such reflections, deeply and solemnly impressed with the responsibility which he incurs, and painfully sensible of his own many deficiencies, the author is aware that the work in which he is engaged is of no small importance, for it embraces the entire scheme of human redemption, and the whole circle of religious obligations; and of no inconsiderable difficulty—for its province is categorically to affirm the truth with respect to questions, in which the wisest and the best of men have differed in opinion."

Dr. B. is so full of his subject, as sometimes to press into his service passages which have but a remote and slight bearing on the main point: but his anxiety to leave nothing untouched which might contribute to his purpose, may plead a very sufficient apology. He has discharged his task with conscientious fidelity, and brought together documents extremely interesting to those who are studious of our ecclesiastical history.

Atonement, and of Grace, and of Predestination, and the present state of the sacred text, are points upon which much doubt and misapprehension are wont to prevail, and which should at all times be clearly and rightly understood. They are points which originally belong to the investigation of the learned, by means of whose easy and familiar expositions, they may be accommodated to the capacities of unlearned men, and may be generally improved to the removal of objections to a public conformity with the established Church, and to the advancement of peace and consolation in the moments of private reflection.

These points are discussed by Mr. Strong in Six Discourses, preached before the University of Oxford, and now offered to the notice of well-educated men, to whose confirmation in a Scriptural faith they are well adapted, and by whom they will not be less appreciated or approved, because Mr. Strong modestly disclaims all pretensions to ingenuity, eloquence, or research. They are principally intended

"To invite the attention of the younger clergy, and more particularly of those who are candidates for ordination, to some matters of great consequence, which are often seriously misunderstood; and to warn them against certain errors, which have sometimes proved disgraceful to the clerical profession, and injurious to the Christian cause."

The importance of the topics, the vehemence with which they are brought into the discussion of every day, and the ease and perspicuity with which they are treated by Mr. Strong, will render the present volume an acceptable summary to all who are entering upon the study of theology, and are desirous of acquiring a competent knowledge of Christian truth, and have not the means of collecting, or the leisure for consulting, more voluminous and elaborate discourses.

The purpose of the first Discourse is to shew, that no countenance is given in the Apostolical writ-

Six Discourses, preached before the University of Oxford. By Thomas Linwood Strong, B.D. of Oriel College, Oxford, Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Llandaff. 158 pp. Rivingtons. 1821.

THE unity and integrity of the Christian faith, the doctrines of the

ings to the propagation of discordant articles of faith. The mind of man has ever been too prone to form private conceptions of religious truth, and if none has been found to defend the innocence of positive error, many have maintained, that there is no offence in the varieties of religious belief. The Scriptures are quoted without hesitation in vindication of this latitude of religious opinion, and the example and authority of St. Paul are alleged in proof, that the peculiar doctrines which are taught are matter of little concern, if they are but collected from the word of God. The appeal is made to the difficult text of the Apostle to the Philippians, (i. 15—18.) and Mr. Strong has rendered good service to the Church in proving the irrelevancy of the appeal, by an exact interpretation of the passage, in its connexion with the general spirit and occasion of the Epistle. The substance of the exposition is thus recapitulated :

"The Apostle is speaking exclusively of the state of the Christian Church at Rome at a particular time, and the sentiments he expresses are, in all respects, worthy of himself and of that holy religion which he so firmly believed and practised. He describes the different motives by which different preachers were actuated, but does not intimate that any diversity of doctrine prevailed among them. The observation of Erasmus upon this passage appears both just and luminous: '*Non Paulus de his loquitur, qui docebant hereticæ, sed qui recte licet animo parum sincero. Nec hos probat tamen: sed negat sibi discutendum, quo animo id faciant, modo prosint.*' The whole scope of the Apostle's discourse is confined to the character of the man. A contrast is drawn between two classes of preachers, who were then engaged in propagating the Gospel at Rome. One class was actuated '*by envy and strife,*' the other by '*good will.*' The one laboured '*in pretence,*' the other '*in truth.*' But as the pretensions of both were equally fair, the general congregation of Christians, to whom their instructions were addressed, did not perceive the hypocritical character of the former class; and, consequently, their preaching was productive of as much public benefit as if they had been truly

influenced by the noblest zeal for religion, and as if they had been exempt from those base and malevolent passions which were, in fact, the main spring of their exertions. The words '*in pretence*' and '*in truth,*' on which the misinterpretation of the passage seems chiefly to rest, have no allusion to the nature of the doctrines preached, but relate solely to the private motive of the preacher. They who preached in pretence, as we have already seen, were the Apostle's personal enemies. They preached to others the unadulterated doctrines of the Gospel; but, at the same time, under pretence of a zeal for religion, they gratified those passions which religion especially forbids. The same persons are said, in the fifteenth verse, to '*preach Christ,*' a phrase which is never applied, in Scripture, without some qualification, to any but the preachers of true religion. So, again, the words '*in truth*' do not here mean sound doctrine, in opposition to false, but a pure and honest motive, in opposition to a corrupt one. If they are understood to signify purity of doctrine, the whole passage is thrown into confusion; whereas, the Apostle's discourse, according to the other interpretation, is perfectly clear and natural in all its parts." P. 11.

This interpretation is confirmed by the general analogy of the Scriptures, and especially of the writings of St. Paul, who was distinguished by his zeal in contending for sound doctrine and the unity of a settled faith, and in opposing in conjunction with the other Apostles, the progress of error and heresy. The same analogy of the Scriptures will confute another popular misapprehension of the text, in which it is arbitrarily brought in defence of the ministrations of private and unauthorized teachers, as if ordination to the ministry were a matter of indifference, or as if St. Paul had never recorded the pleasure with which he beheld the order of the Colossians, or had never warned the Romans to mark such as caused divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which they had learned. The conclusion of Mr. Strong is as applicable to schism as it is to dissent:

"If St. Paul had intended, in the language of my text, to represent uniformity of faith as a matter of indifference, he

would have contradicted himself and other inspired teachers of the Apostolical Church. But if the words be applied to the motives of the preachers, without reference to their doctrine, they will be found in perfect harmony with the general declarations of Holy Writ." P. 17.

It has been sometimes supposed, that the severe judgment pronounced upon unbelief, especially in the last commission of our Lord recorded by St. Mark, is irreconcilable with the mercies revealed in the Gospel, but it is shewn by Mr. Strong in the second Discourse, to be no valid objection to a revelation otherwise authenticated, and proved of Divine origin. The sentence in its just interpretation, is applicable to none but those who possess and neglect the opportunities of Christian knowledge; and, as in the preceding clause, obedience is implied in the promise made to such as believe and are baptized, so the condemnation of those who believe not, is founded on their deliberate and voluntary rejection of the truth. While Christianity thus considers the relative opportunities of its disciples, *we*, who have the opportunity of believing, are inexcusable in infidelity, and it becomes a question of the deepest interest and importance, what is the doctrine professed in baptism, of which the rejection incurs the judgment pronounced on unbelief? The obvious and only answer is, that it is the doctrine of the Trinity, which, as well as all other doctrines of the Gospel, it is necessary to preserve whole and undefiled. The Preacher is thus led to animadvert on the composition and spirit of the Nicene or Constantinopolitan and the Athanasian Creeds, to the former of which an anathema founded on the text (Mark xvi. 16.) was originally annexed, but formed no part of the Creed: the damnable clauses, as they are called, of the latter, although equally authorized and sanctioned, have been the frequent occasion of cavilling and dispute:

"When our Saviour said, 'He that believeth not shall be damned,' he doubtless intended to denounce punishment on all who, with sufficient means of information, might reject, or wilfully corrupt the doctrines of his religion; but not on those who might be ignorant of the Gospel, or incapable of attaining a competent knowledge of its doctrines and conditions. It is clearly the perverse disposition of individuals, not the deficiency of their knowledge, against which his anger is denounced. So the language of the Athanasian Creed is intended to condemn all wilful depravation of the truth, and obstinate infidelity. In this sense it has always been understood by the most temperate and judicious writers of the Church of England; and it is, perhaps, worthy of remark, that the commissioners who were appointed to revise the Liturgy, in the first year of King William the Third, had resolved to prepare a rubric to this effect: 'the condemning clauses are to be understood as relating only to those who obstinately deny the substance of the Christian faith.' It is well known that the main object of this commission was at last abandoned; but the fact that such a rubric was prepared by the commissioners is a proof of the construction which they put upon the damnable clauses of the Athanasian Creed. In attaching this sense to the clauses in question they acted in conformity both to Scripture and reason, and bequeathed a lesson of wisdom and moderation to the clergy of future times. Although the rubric which they proposed was not inserted in the Liturgy, it may tend to confirm our judgment and to produce much private satisfaction in a point of acknowledged difficulty. As our Saviour did not think it necessary to guard the strong language of my text, but has left us to understand it with such exceptions as common sense and the general principles of his religion might suggest, so we may understand these clauses of the Creed as a broad and general statement of an important truth, which applies, in different degrees, to different persons, and must, therefore, always be received in a qualified sense." P. 36.

The doctrine of the Athanasian Creed, is true, and is founded in the Scriptures, and was designed to counteract many pernicious heresies, with which we are not at liberty to compromise the faith of the Gospel, and which may at all

times be disclaimed without incurring a charge of intolerance:

"It appears, then, that the language of the Athanasian Creed is not more severe than the language of our Saviour and his Apostles; and, moreover, that similar expressions were used by the Church in primitive times, not with a presumptuous intention of anticipating the decisions of almighty wisdom, but simply with a view of protecting the 'everlasting Gospel' from the errors of the weak and the designs of the wicked. On the same ground we are required to use the Athanasian Creed. It becomes us to recite that ancient formula, not in a spirit of intolerance and pride, but with humility, charity, and faith; in the earnest hope that it may please God 'to have mercy on all Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics; to take from them all ignorance, hardness of heart, and contempt of his word, and so fetch them home to his flock; that they may be saved among the remnant of the true Israelites, and be made one fold under one Shepherd, Jesus Christ our Lord.'—P. 40.

The doctrine of Universal Atonement, and the doctrine of Universal Grace, are argued in the third and fourth Discourses, with reference to the objections of the Socinians, whose confidence in maintaining their peculiar opinions, whose subtlety in the perversion of Scriptural truth, and whose endeavours to abate the sovereign authority of the Scriptures, render it necessary at all times to warn the young and inexperienced of their delusive arguments. The general doctrine of St. Paul concerning the Atonement, in Romans v. 7, 8. is too plain to be misunderstood, notwithstanding the variety and the difficulty of interpreting the particular expressions of a "just" and a "good" man, which are not unfrequently opposed in the Scriptures, and of which the first may be thought to respect the rigour of the Law, and the last the benevolence of the Gospel. Mr. Strong interprets the latter expression, of a benefactor:

"It is well known that the word *αγαθος*, which occurs here, is used: not only in

Scripture, but in the purest writings of antiquity, to signify a benefactor, a sense which appears to harmonize exactly with the general spirit of the text before us. According to this interpretation St. Paul's language may be thus paraphrased:—'Scarcely would a man die for the sake of a fellow-creature, in whose character the noblest qualities were combined. I will not absolutely maintain, however, that such a thing is impossible where specialties of gratitude and love are added to that high veneration which a virtuous character naturally excites; but this is the utmost extent to which human benevolence and affection can be carried. Mark, then, how far the love of God towards men exceeds the most devoted attachment of man to his fellow-creatures. God commendeth his love towards us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man should lay down his life for his friends. But the Son of God died for his enemies, for those who were in open allegiance to the prince of darkness, sunk in the abominations of idolatry, and utterly estranged in heart and mind from the knowledge and service of the true God.' P. 52.

It was plainly the doctrine of St. Paul, and indeed of all the Apostles, that Christ died for a sinful world: and his death is both unequivocally called an Atonement, and may be demonstratively shewn to be an Atonement, from a comparison with the Mosaic sacrifices. In its benefits, the sacrifice of his death included not only the first disciples, but all mankind. These are certain truths in the judgment of the Christian believer, and the more they are perverted, the more necessary is it, that they should be explained. They are mysterious truths, but they are not therefore unreasonable; they have their evidence in our own hearts, and in the deep conviction of our own necessities.

In his address to the Jews on the day of Pentecost, St. Peter may be thought to have referred especially, and almost exclusively, to the miraculous effusion of the Holy Spirit, and to that event, and to the extraordinary powers of the Apostles, it

is known, that the Socinians would restrict the whole doctrine of the Holy Spirit of God. Mr. Strong, in a very luminous and satisfactory argument, refutes this opinion, by the citation of various predictions of the ancient Prophets, expressed in very full and general terms, which can hardly be understood of any other subject, than the effusion of Divine grace, on a scale much more extensive than can be applicable to the miraculous gifts of the Apostolic age :

"A well-known passage of Jeremiah may also be produced in confirmation of the same point. 'Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people.' It would be difficult to give a consistent exposition of this passage, which is so frequently cited as a prediction of the Gospel, without especial reference to the influence of the Spirit bestowed upon mankind, under the Christian economy, for the ordinary purposes of salvation. For the prophet not only anticipates the superior holiness and efficacy of that dispensation which was to succeed the law, but alludes expressly to the more intimate communion which was then to subsist between the Deity and his creatures. 'I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts.' In the New Testament the Mosaic covenant is called the 'law of a carnal commandment,' and the Christian 'the ministration of the Spirit.' The strongest expressions are also used to describe that holy intercourse which subsists between the Spirit of God and the souls of the faithful. 'He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit,—know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which ye have of God?—therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's.'" P. 76.

The concluding words of this prophecy of Jeremiah, are frequently repeated by the Prophet Ezekiel, and they are expressly applied by

the Apostle to the communion of the Holy Spirit with the faithful: "Ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people."

"It may be sufficient to produce one more testimony from the prophetic Scriptures. Ezekiel, having assured his countrymen that their own perverseness was the cause of all their calamities, comforts them with a distant prospect of divine mercy, and breaks forth into expressions which can only apply, in their full sense, to the times or economy of the Gospel. 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you. And I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and will give you an heart of flesh, and I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes.'—Here, surely, is rather a description than a prophecy of the ordinary operation of divine grace upon the Christian Church, without any apparent reference to that special degree of illumination which was limited to the Apostolic age. A manifest allusion is also made to the sacrament of Baptism, by which the first portion of sanctifying grace is bestowed, and a principle of spiritual life implanted in the soul of man. It is impossible to read those words of the Prophet, 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean,' without remarking how exactly they correspond with the language of the New Testament on the doctrine of Baptism. 'Arise,' said Ananias to St. Paul, 'and wash away thy sins.' 'He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' And in the verse immediately preceding my text, St. Peter thus addresses his audience: 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' To the same effect is that noble and spirited exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews: 'Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.'" P. 78.

These prophecies are sufficient to justify the inference, that the gifts of the Holy Spirit are commensu-

rate with the death of Christ, and correspond in importance and extent with his atonement and mediation, as they are equally essential to our Salvation :

"As, then, we believe, on the surest warrant of Holy Writ, in the doctrine of universal redemption by the blood of Christ, so must we believe, on the same authority, in the universality of divine grace. These doctrines, indeed, even as distinct topics of contemplation, may well engage all the faculties of the mind while they correct and elevate the affections of the heart : but if we view them in connection, the mercy of God shines forth in brighter colours, and the whole subject assumes a higher degree of sublimity and importance. We then perceive more clearly that redemption, in the widest sense of the word, is not confined to families or to nations. No groundless or arbitrary distinctions are made between those who are children of the same parent. 'God hath made of one blood all nations ;' 'he will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.' In furtherance of this design he has established such a covenant and provided such means of grace as will comprehend all who are willing to embrace them. To different persons, indeed, in different ages of the world, he has assigned situations of greater or less advantage, with respect to the knowledge of his will. But this does not affect the main position. It is still true, that 'in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him ;' and that, 'if there be a willing mind it is accepted according to that a man *hath*, and not according to that he hath not.'"
P. 83.

It is also true, that nothing but obstinate and wilful transgression, can deprive a man of this grace, which is diffused wherever the Gospel is revealed, and operates wherever it is not resisted or despised : which is not denied even to the wicked, until by their obduracy they have excluded themselves from all further participation of the gift, and which is vouchsafed as it is essentially requisite and necessary to every man, who is earnest in his endeavours to fulfil the sublime and arduous duties of Christian morality.

The doctrine of Universal Grace may be thought to conflict, as in truth it corresponds and is connected with, the doctrine of Predestination, a doctrine which it is of high importance to understand, and of which the true knowledge can only be acquired from a severe and diligent examination of the Scriptures. The great foundations of this doctrine are laid in the Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians : in the former of which the Divine knowledge precedes the decree, and comprehends the means and condition, as well as the end or final result. In the Epistle to the Ephesians the same order is implied. Mr. Strong's argument is conducted on the hypothesis of a predestination of individuals to eternal life : we cannot conceal our preference of the exposition of Mr. Young, in his Sermon on Predestination ; a Sermon, conducted on the soundest principles of Scriptural interpretation, most irrefragable in argument, and conveying the most powerful consolation to the perplexed and doubtful mind in a clear demonstration, that the purpose of God, according to St. Paul, respects the conversion of the Gentiles to the faith and privileges of the Gospel.

The doctrine of the Church of England, concerning this and every other religious truth, is founded in the Scriptures, and it is not possible to read the Discourse of Dr. Winchester on the Seventeenth Article, or the luminous analysis of that Discourse, annexed by Dr. Copleston to his Sermons on Predestination, without observing the scrupulous anxiety of the Reformers, upon whom the discussion was forced by the controversies of the day, to avoid all human exposition, and to adhere to the unsophisticated language of Scripture. The Seventeenth Article is, in fact, a compilation from the Scriptures, and whatever sense the Scriptures can be demonstrated to bear, that sense is the doctrine of the Church of Eng-

laud. The Article itself maintains : "*we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth in Holy Scripture.*"

"The word Predestination is not introduced in the Liturgy, for the best and most obvious reasons, but the doctrine itself is recognized in such manner as may produce a salutary effect on the minds of ordinary men, without exciting any groundless apprehensions, or drawing their attention to dark and mysterious subjects. In the Burial Service we pray that it may please God 'shortly to accomplish the number of his elect, and to hasten his kingdom.' Here we profess our belief that the character and conduct of all mankind, past, present, and to come, are so entirely open to the eye of God, that the very number of those who shall be saved is absolutely determined." P. 109.

"*The number of the elect*" is not a Scriptural expression: it occurs in the Epistle of Clemens Romanus, and however definitive *the number* may seem to be, *the elect*, in the language of that Apostolical father, is sufficiently comprehensive.

Mr. Strong's last Sermon is on the purity and integrity of the Sacred Text, and on the rules by which that purity and integrity may be ascertained. It is valuable as an elementary discourse on an important branch of professional study, and the remarks on the critical character

of Griesbach and Wetstein will not be read without profit, if they preserve the reader from an unworthy deference to the authority of great names. The texts (Acts xx. 28.) has been most severely debated, and forms an useful praxis in a Discourse on Sacred Criticism, and affords, at the same time, an occasion of practical exhortation to the imitation of the Apostles, and the great Exemplars of our own Church.

There are three appendixes to these Discourses: of which, the first treats of the formation of a part of the Constantinopolitan Creed, and exhibits the ancient Creeds of Jerusalem and of Rome: the second briefly notices Calvin's doctrine of Predestination: the third relates to the authority of the Fathers in ascertaining the text of Scripture, and contains a brief, but curious and interesting, examination of those passages of the Fathers, to which Wetstein appeals in vindication of the reading of *Κυρον*, in Acts xx. 28., and which are shewn to be utterly irrelevant.

There is nothing in this little volume, of which theologians will not approve, or of which well-educated men should not blush to be ignorant.

MONTHLY REGISTER.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE
ENLARGEMENT AND BUILDING
OF CHURCHES AND CHAPELS.

THE Anniversary Meeting of this Society was held on the 20th day of May, at the Society's Rooms, in Lincoln's Inn Fields, present, the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the chair; Bishop of London, Bishop of Chester, Bishop of Llandaff, Lord Kenyon, Dean of Carlisle, Archdeacon of Cambridge, Archdeacon Watson, Archdeacon Blomfield, Rev. Dr. Shepherd, Rev. Dr. Words-

worth, George Gipps, Esq. M. P. Joshua Watson, Esq. together with a large assembly of subscribers to the institution.

Report.—During the last year, the aid of the Society has been applied for in 68 cases, several of which are still under consideration. 54 grants have been made, and by this assistance, Church room has been provided for 16,891 persons; and this increased accommodation furnishes 12,764 free and unappropriated sittings, about three-fourths of the whole number. The grants made by the Society to promote this object, have amounted to £15,551.

Statement of Contributions.—Donations, £60,321. 16s. 10d. Annual Subscriptions, £626. 10s.

The Committee have especial pleasure in reporting, that during the last year, the Society has received two anonymous donations of Five Hundred Pounds each.

During the two preceding years, warrants were issued for the payment of £13,212, the amount of 70 grants, and the sum of £11,140, the amount of 44 grants, has been paid during the last year, making the number of grants where the work has been completed 114, and the whole amount actually paid, £24,352. Other grants have been voted by the Society at different times, to the amount of £29,281 which will be paid upon the receipt of the usual certificates, that the works have been satisfactorily completed.

The mention of such places as the Island of Serk, the Scilly Islands, the Parish Church of Stapleton, and in that of St. George, comprehending the village of Pill, both in the populous neighbourhood of Bristol; St. Peter's, Nottingham, a town in which the want of Church room is most seriously felt; the Parish Church of Walsall, and Lane End Chapel, the one situated in the midst of the Iron works, and the other among the Potteries of Staffordshire, will probably be of itself sufficient to shew the inability of the respective inhabitants, to provide themselves with the additional Church room they so much wanted, without some foreign aid. That aid has been given by this Society, and in some cases to a very large amount, where the circumstances seemed not merely to justify but to demand it. In other instances, where the ability of the Parish was greater, and the contribution of the Society has consequently been less, its usefulness has still been as strongly manifested; for it has appeared by acknowledgments received, that without the impulse thus given, the increased accommodation would never have been procured.

These instances, coupled with the general statement of their operations, will serve to shew that the expectation and promise of aid have encouraged and enabled the inhabitants of various parishes to begin and complete the enlargement or improvement of their respective Churches and Chapels. Consequently, they shew the great utility of this Society, and the important results with which it has been mainly instrumental in producing. As far as its sphere of action can extend, it provides for the wants of an increasing population. It has already contributed to furnish in different Churches and Chapels of

our Establishment more than 66,000 additional seats, of which nearly 50,000 are free, and unappropriated.

Consecration of Pancras Church.

On the 7th of May the new Parish Church of St. Pancras, the first stone of which was laid by his Royal Highness the Duke of York on the 1st of July, 1819, was consecrated by the Lord Bishop of London.

The Church is situated on the south side of the New Road, having its western front in Euston Square; and is so conspicuously placed, that it has attracted a good deal of public attention during the progress of its erection, by its unusual size, and peculiar style of architecture.

A short account of the building itself, and of the dedication of it to its holy purpose, may therefore be acceptable to our readers.

The doors of the Church were opened at ten o'clock, and at half-past eleven the Lord Bishop of London, and the Lord Bishop of Llandaff, entered at the great western door, where they were met by the ecclesiastical officers of the Diocese, the Vicar, Churchwardens, and twelve of the Trustees of the Church. The Bishop proceeded to the front of the altar, and there received from the Vicar, the Rev. Dr. Moore, the petition to consecrate, which was read by the Registrar. A procession was then formed, according to the usual order, which passed down the middle aisle, the Bishops and Clergy repeating alternately verses of the 24th Psalm, and returned up it to the altar rails, within which the Bishop of London, and his two Chaplains took their seats. The Vicar having presented the Acts of Parliament, and deeds of conveyance, which were laid on the communion table, the Bishop began the first part of the dedication service, at the end of which the sentence of consecration was read by the Chancellor, Sir C. Robinson, signed by the Bishop, and delivered to the Registrar.

The Morning Service, including the Psalms and Lessons appointed for the occasion, was then read from the desk by the Rev. Dr. Burrow, one of the trustees. The Communion Service from the altar, by the Bishop; the Epistle and Gospel, by his two Chaplains, Mr. Oakley and Mr. Jones. An Anthem was sung after the Second Lesson, and another after the Prayers, by the gentlemen and choristers of the Chapel Royal. The 100th Psalm before the Sermon, by the children of the St. Pancras National Schools, of whom, 600 were seated on each side of the organ.

The Sermon was preached by the Vicar, who took as his text Psalm xvi. 9.; and the service was concluded from the altar by the Right Reverend Prelate.

The propriety with which all the arrangements for the detail of the Consecration had been made, and the exactness with which they were executed, entirely prevented any thing like disorder or interruption. The service, and the scene together were as affecting and as gratifying to the religious observer, as can well be conceived. The day of consecration of its Church will long be remembered in the Parish of St. Pancras, as a proud and happy day, and even by those who are not immediately concerned, with thankfulness to Almighty God, for having brought this work to its completion, to the honour of his name, and the support of the Church of England.

The new building, becoming on its consecration, the Parish Church, has been erected at the sole charge of the Parishioners, who with a most laudable zeal, and a liberality which redounds highly to their credit, have by the authority of a local Act of Parliament, constructed an edifice, which, with regard both to the valuable and substantial quality of the materials (the whole exterior being of Portland stone and Terra cotta, more durable than stone, and the interior of oak;) and to the provision for accommodating as large a number of the inhabitants as possible without exceeding the compass of the human voice, is not surpassed by any sacred structure in the metropolis, if indeed it be equalled by any. Such a building is not to be finished at a small expence: and it is a matter of no small praise to the parishioners, that they have cheerfully expended a very considerable sum upon an object so worthy of their generous exertions. It should be known, too, that a large Parochial Chapel is already begun at Camden Town, to be built under the provisions of the same Act, and to be paid for out of the same funds as the Church, collected by an easy rate upon the parish.

As the architectural design is very different from any thing to which the public eye has been accustomed in this country; and as it puts in a claim to consideration in consequence of its being the first attempt to introduce the principles of Grecian architecture, as distinguished from the Roman, into our ecclesiastical buildings of magnitude and importance, it may not be amiss to mention the authority which exists for the several parts of the building, and the manner in which the an-

tient models have been adapted to the present purpose. The design of Mr. Inwood, which is now executed, was originally selected by the Board of Trustees as being more simple, more commodious, more accordant with the best standards of taste, than any other, out of the many which were submitted to them. The enormous expence of erecting a Gothic, or English Church, equal in durability and execution, to what might be effected in a less elaborate style, determined them against attempting to build a Church, which after all could only be a very humble imitation of the magnificent cathedrals which attest the endless resources of the hierarchy in the days of Roman Catholic ascendancy, but defy all competition in these more economical and unostentatious times. The plan adopted, therefore, was of a different kind; and the models to which it was determined to adhere, as closely as might be practicable, were taken from the spot where science once flourished in its greatest splendour. The Erechtheum, the small Ionic Temple which still stands on the Acropolis of Athens, the eastern portico of which was dedicated to Erechtheus, the sixth king of Athens; the western to Minerva Polias, the supposed protectress of the city; and the attached little fane, or southern wing, to Pandrosus, the grand-daughter of Erechtheus, has been as nearly copied in the design of St. Pancras Church as difference of circumstances and destinations would allow.

It is understood that the Erechtheum was completed about B.C. 400, having been in progress during a period of about forty years, in which the fine arts were raised to their highest pitch of glory by the taste and munificence of Pericles, and the skill of Phidias and Ictinus. It is to be expected, therefore, that the decorations and proportions of a building of that date should be of the first rank of art; and such the remains of the Erechtheum are esteemed.

In a modern Christian Church it is impossible to adhere servilely to the precise construction of a Pagan temple; nor is it desirable that it should be attempted; but in following the proportions very nearly, and the decorations even minutely, in deviating from the forms and ornaments only where there is necessity—that is, in adapting whatever is admirable in the beautiful remnants of ancient art to the character and purposes of a Church of England, all that can be done, is done, for the preservation of good taste. Whatever deviations from the model have been found necessary in St. Pancras Church, they have been

made on the principles, as it would appear, of Grecian architecture. Thus, for example, the tower, or steeple, is deemed a necessary appendage to a Church, and therefore ought not to be omitted, however it may interfere with the style of those ages in which no such things were allowed to break up the long extended horizontal line. In submission to established custom, the tower of St. Pancras is raised to a considerable height, and it is composed, not copied, from the tower of the Winds, or Clepsydra, at Athens; a building, indeed, certainly of much later date, and consequently of less authority than the temple of Erechtheus, but suitable in many respects (and the only one in Greece which is so) to the purpose of an English ornamental Campanulum. As we find in the Propylæa, or entrance to the Acropolis, that the portico is Doric, but the inner range of columns Ionic, most remarkably brought down to the simplicity of the Doric, by stripping them of their volutes; so here it seems to have been the intention of the architect to adopt the least decorated example of Corinthian, because it more nearly assimilated with the Ionic of the portico; by this means, very judiciously availing himself of the effect of gradual transition, rather than strong contrast. On the summit of the tower, which in the original supported a shifting vane, is planted the cross, the sacred symbol of our faith. On that elevated pinnacle it stands (and long may it stand!) an emblem of the triumph of Christianity, over the boasted influence of heathen superstition. It appropriately terminates the edifice, on the front stone of which is inscribed, in the character and dialect used when the Erechtheum was erected,

“Μακαρι φως Ευαγγελιστος αει
φωτιζοι της Εθνων αφανις νεως.

With respect to the construction of the interior, it appears as if the great desideratum, facility of hearing and seeing in a large building, were really attained. The Church contains upwards of 2200 sittings, and yet simply by avoiding all obstructions to the voice, all heavy piers and angular projections, by leaving a free passage below the galleries, and a large uninterrupted area above them, it seems as if no difficulty would be experienced, on ordinary occasions, either by the officiating minister, or his congregation, as to speaking and hearing. Upon the whole, the simplicity which is characteristic of the style of architecture, and the excellence of the proportions, which diminishes at least

one-third the apparent magnitude of the building, the beauty of the mouldings and ornaments, combined with the richness of the communion plate and hangings, presented on the day of consecration a fine architectural treat to those who are fond, and are capable to judge, of the niceties of the fine arts, applied to the best of purposes.

The exterior is not yet complete, and is therefore scarcely a fair subject for criticism. It is impossible to judge of the effect of the portico, till the capitals are placed upon the columns, or of the Mausoleum buildings, till the female figures, after the original, are fixed in their intended stations. From what is complete, however, we have reason to expect that every attention will be paid, and every endeavour used to render the whole as great an honour to the age, as the several parts are creditable to the individuals who have executed them.

Tyldesley Banks Church.

TYLDESLEY BANKS has attracted the attention of His Majesty's Commissioners for the Building of National Churches, and, with great propriety, they have determined to apply a part of the Funds, appropriated for the purpose of adding to the number of Churches, to the erection of one at this rapidly increasing town, which is situate in one of the most populous Manufacturing districts of this county, —and during the life of the present proprietor of the land, THOMAS JOHNSON, Esq. has increased from two farm houses, by which the whole site of the present town was occupied on his inheriting the estate from his father, to upwards of 700 houses, and nearly 5000 inhabitants! The want of accommodation for this population in an Established Church, has been of late years, severely felt. A remedy is now in progress. For some time back a great number of workmen have been employed in preparation of the foundation, &c., and on Tuesday last, the 23d instant, on the commemorating day of St. George, the Patron Saint of England, and in honour of whom the Church is to be named, the chief foundation-stone was laid.

At one o'clock, the Ladies and Gentlemen of the town and neighbourhood, preceded by a band of music, moved from the residence of THOMAS JOHNSON, Esq., (the donor of the land, for the Church and Church-yard) to the ground, where the ceremony commenced, by singing the old version of the 100th Psalm. The stone being elevated, by means of a triangle, &c. Mr. JOHN HUNTER, the superintendent of

the work, being presented with a silver trowel for the purpose, was requested to take upon himself the honour of laying the first stone, which was accordingly lowered, and, in its bed, covered a glass-case, containing various coins and medals of the reigning Sovereign. When the stone was fully adjusted, the Rev. JOSEPH HODGKINSON, M.A. Vicar of Leigh, in which parish the town of Tyldesley Banks is situated, put up to the God, to whose Worship the Church, in due time, will be consecrated, a most appropriate prayer, which he delivered in a feeling and impressive manner, as he implored the Divine Blessing on the pious work which was commenced. The ceremony was concluded by singing the National Anthem "*God save the King*," and by a general acclamation of "*Health and Long Life to King George the Fourth, Duke of Lancaster*," which was followed by four times four most hearty cheers.

LAW PROCEEDINGS.

Right of Clergymen to controul the singing in Church; and the ringing of Church Bells.

Case submitted to Dr. Lushington, and his opinion thereon.

In consequence of the curate and churchwardens of the parish of Chardstock, Dorset, (a peculiar in the Church of Salisbury) having refused the bells to the ringers on the abandonment of the pains and penalties bill—the belfry door was forced open for three successive nights, and the ringers rung in defiance, and other tumultuous proceedings took place in the parish. The Rev. Thomas Babb, the licensed and resident curate applied to a justice of the peace, who on the 20th November last committed the ringers for refusing to find bail, (though gratuitously offered to them) to the next sessions to answer for a riot and forcibly breaking open the belfry door; and likewise bound over the curate and churchwardens to prosecute; who preferred a bill which was ignoramus'd by the grand jury. Some of the ringers formed part of the choir, the remainder of whom ceased from that period to sing. In consequence of which, Mr. Babb had the children of the Sunday school taught to sing, and they began on the 25th December, and continued without interruption till Sunday afternoon the 14th January last, when the singers, namely Benjamin Denning, and eight others, including three of the ringers, (being the next Sunday after their liberation from prison) began to sing at the same time as the children, on which the

latter desisted. The psalm selected was the 35th. new version; the first four verses and the eleventh which last verse was not usually sung: such psalm having been selected for the occasion as one of the singers confessed, by acknowledging to a person who remonstrated with him that it was not by his wish it was sung, and that he was sorry for it. On Sunday the 21st. the children sung in the morning; in the afternoon after Mr. Babb had commenced reading the prayer for the King, the singers struck out with their instruments, and though he continued reading they sung; in consequence of which, Mr. Babb stopt, but not until he had almost finished the prayer. It must be observed, that it has never been the practice to sing in this Church after the third collect. During this time the Church was thrown into confusion, and several people left it. Mr. Babb on stopping beckoned to one of the churchwardens, who came up near the reading desk, and on Mr. Babb's whispering to him to observe who were singing he fell down in a fit, several people came round him, and carried him out of Church; the singers continued singing all the time: some of the persons who went out returned, and others did not. On going out of Church after the service Mr. Benjamin Denning one of the singers was heard to say, that their singing had thinned the Church it was too warm before; and James Dum another singer conversing the same evening respecting what the person would now think of the singing, said "we han't done with him yet." On Sunday the 28th before morning service Mr. Deane one of the churchwardens read to the singers then present; viz. Mr. Benjamin Denning and three others the following note from Mr. Babb. "Mr. Babb begs Mr. Deane as churchwarden, to inform the singers that he will not permit the service of the Church to be again interrupted by them, and from their extremely improper conduct on Sunday last, the 21st instant that they will cease to sing in the Parish Church of Chardstock until Mr. Babb is satisfied that from a conviction of their error no such disgraceful occurrences will again occur." *Vicarage, Chardstock, 21st. Jan. 1821.*

Said Mr. Benjamin Denning read the note first to himself, and afterwards aloud, Harrison also read it, and James Smith said, they were the first singers and would sing. They did not however attempt to sing; but after the children had sung a verse, James Smith rose from his seat, went down from the gallery in a very noisy manner, several boys following him,

most of whom again returned, but he walked out of Church and remained in the church-yard till the service was over. A few people left the Church at the same time. Mr. Benjamin Denning asked for a copy of the note which the churchwarden refused, and Mr. Denning added that he should not consider it as notice, and should sing as usual. In the afternoon after Mr. Babb had commenced the prayer for the King the instruments struck out, and James Smith gave out an anthem and then continued singing and playing whilst Mr. Babb was reading the prayer for the King, for the Royal Family, for the Clergy and People, for the High Court of Parliament, and the greater part of the prayer for all conditions of men: several of the congregation quitted the Church, and before the sermon they sung again.

On Saturday the 3rd February, the following notice was served personally on the singers nine in number. "I hereby give you and each of you notice not to play on any musical instrument whatever in the Parish Church of Chardstock, and I do hereby give you and each of you further notice not to sing any part of the services, hymn, anthem or psalm in the said Parish Church, without my previous consent in writing first obtained for that purpose. Witness my hand this 3rd. day of February, 1821.

Thomas Babb, Curate of Chardstock."

On Sunday morning the 4th. the children were allowed to sing without interruption. In the afternoon Benjamin Denning, and six other singers, and some strangers were in the singing gallery, and as soon as the children began to sing (after the prayers were concluded,) they all (except James Denning) rose up hastily, and noisily lifting up the seats on which they sat, went down from the gallery and walked out of the Church, nearly one third of the congregation followed. During the sermon, gravel, &c. was thrown against the chancel window, and stones drawn against the wall of the Church to create a noise. After Mr. Babb had been preaching about five or six minutes a great noise being made at the south door, Mr. Deane the churchwarden went out of Church, and saw some boys running away, from whence he proceeded to the ale-house, where he saw said Benjamin Denning and upwards of thirty people with liquor and pipes, and on Mr. Deane's saying, "This is bad doings gentlemen," some one replied, the service was over when they left the Church; James Denning

one of the singers was observed making signals whilst the children were singing to persons to leave the Church, and several apparently obeyed them by going out as before-mentioned.

Query 1st.—Whether the right of controuling the choir and directing or preventing their singing altogether is not vested by law in the officiating minister, and whether in the present case the choir having ceased to sing and a new choir being formed by the minister the old choir had any right to resume and interrupt the service?

Query 2d.—Whether any and what steps may be successfully taken, against whom of the above persons for singing;—1st. At a part of the service when it has not been usual for the choir to sing, and thereby interrupting the service. 2ndly. In singing after the notice read to them; and 3dly. In leaving the Church in the manner stated before the sermon?

You are also desired to advise on the propriety and expediency of taking any and what steps in the Ecclesiastical Court against the ringers, for ringing after having been refused leave, and having been proceeded against in the temporal Court, in the manner above stated, as an indictment has been preferred against the Curate for an assault, in trying to catch a man escaping from the belfry—and an action for false imprisonment brought against him, by one of the ringers.

"It is especially the duty of the minister to take care that every part of public worship be properly and decorously performed; and in order to effect this he must conform to the law, when it gives him directions sufficiently specific, and when it does not he must act upon his own discretion subject to responsibility to the ordinary. I think it clearly follows from this general and undoubted principle that the control and direction of all singing in the Church must belong to him under limitations I will presently advert to. He may in my opinion being always responsible to the ordinary in case he acts indiscreetly, direct what and how much of the psalms, being the allowed versions shall be sung, what tunes shall be used, and at what times they shall be sung, not contravening the directions of the Book of Common Prayer: he may prevent the use of all instruments except, perhaps, in the case of an organ erected by faculty, but I do not think that the minister can lawfully prohibit any parishioner from joining in the singing: if any parishioner so joining behave indecorously, he may be

punished in the ecclesiastical court. I can entertain no doubt that the conduct of the persons complained of is a violation of the decorum which ought to be observed during divine service: the interruption of the minister and the quitting the Church in a tumultuous manner are offences punishable in the ecclesiastical court, and they may be proceeded against by articles. The singing at an improper time, in an improper manner, will form the substance of the articles, and the notice should also be stated, though as I have already observed, it may perhaps be considered as too unlimited a prohibition. This however will not affect the success of the suit, which if supported by proper evidence must terminate in a sentence against the parties proceeded against.

"With respect to the ringing the bells in the manner stated, this is an ecclesiastical offence, and may also be punished by the same court. I do not think the proceedings in the temporal court can, in any degree, affect the jurisdiction in the ecclesiastical court. It appears to me that the prosecution may now be carried on against the ringers, if it be deemed expedient to do so. The proceedings may include the whole conduct of those individuals, but must be against each separately. The court of the Church of Salisbury, is the proper jurisdiction, and care must be taken that the citation be correct, and the articles agree with it."

STEPHEN LUSHINGTON.

*Doctors' Commons,
Feb. 14th, 1821.*

*Report of a Trial at Dorchester,
on Saturday, 17th March, 1821.*

Deem, v. Thomas Babb Clerk.

This cause, which from its public nature and importance, had long excited very considerable interest in the county, came on for trial before Mr. Justice Holroyd, and a full special jury, on Saturday, at Dorchester. The plaintiff, who is a cordwainer, living at Chardstock, in this county, brought this action against the defendant, the resident curate, for a malicious prosecution, in having falsely, maliciously, and without any reasonable cause, with his churchwardens, preferred a bill of indictment against the plaintiff and four others, ringers of the said parish, at the last Dorsetshire sessions, for a riot, and forcibly breaking and entering the belfry of the parish Church, and ringing the bells, without the consent of the minister or churchwardens; which bill was ignoramus'd by the grand

jury. The damages were laid at 1000*l*. Mr. Adam, in a most eloquent speech, addressed the jury, and animadverted on the case being one of as great oppression and as little provocation as he ever remembered, and dwelt on the aggravated conduct of the defendant in having caused the commitment of his client to the House of Correction at Dorchester, on the 20th of November last, by a false representation to the magistrate; where he had been immured during an inclement season, till the sessions held on the 10th of January following; when, notwithstanding the lapse of months, the same vindictive spirit led the Rev. defendant to prefer such bill, without any reasonable cause. The learned counsel, however, expressed himself highly grateful for a special jury, from which his client might expect ample justice and liberal compensation for the injury he had sustained.

Mr. Wilde (one of the counsel of her Majesty in the House of Lords) proceeded to examine the witnesses, who not only failed to establish any malice on the part of the defendant, but distinctly proved, that it was not till after the plaintiff and his associates had been refused leave to ring, by defendant and the churchwarden, and had broken open the belfry door and rung for three successive nights, that they applied to Wm. Tucker, Esq. a magistrate, who examined two persons, (one of whom was called as a witness for the plaintiff) on whose depositions he held that five persons confederating together to do an unlawful act, and breaking open the belfry door, amounted to a riot in law, and told the parties they must find bail to answer the offence. This they refused to do; when the Rev. defendant solicited the constable to bail them, whose bail the plaintiff and others refused to accept; declaring they would not be bailed, but would go to gaol, which they persisted in, in spite of the urgent and ineffectual remonstrances of the magistrate and defendant. Several other witnesses were examined, with a view of proving that no actual riot took place.

Mr. Serjeant Pell, the leading counsel for the defendant, very ably and satisfactorily exposed the total failure of the plaintiff's witnesses to substantiate the statement made by Mr. Adam, on the allegations in the declaration, namely, malice, expressed or implied, arising from want of probable cause, and which was absolutely necessary to support this action; and after commenting with his usual felicity on the contradictory and insufficient evidence of the plaintiff's witnesses, he told the jury

that he should not trouble them with calling his witnesses, as he felt most confident in having a verdict for the defendant, against whom there was not, in the evidence adduced, the slightest ground for sustaining the present action.

The Judge then recapitulated the evidence; and observed, that in order to support this action, it was necessary to establish malice on the part of the defendant, who was not answerable, even if the magistrate had drawn a wrong conclusion from the facts stated; and that in point of law (though it might have been usual to ring without leave) yet the power of refusing the ringers resided in the minister and church-wardens; and that the ringers were wrong doers, in being in the belfry without leave, whether the door had been broken open or not:—and that the conclusion drawn by the magistrate was, that the offence was a riot, and all the evidence supported it; and that no malice appeared to have actuated the defendant, who had applied to the constable to bail the plaintiff, which the latter refused, although the charge of injury was for his being committed to gaol. The jury returned a verdict for the defendant—to the satisfaction of a crowded court; and the judge immediately certified for the special jury. The cause occupied six hours. Counsel for the plaintiff, Mr. Adam, Mr. Wilde, and Mr. Frazer; for the defendant, Mr. Serjeant Pell, and Mr. Moor. Mr. Taunton, of Axminster, attorney for the

plaintiff: and Mr. Tucker, of Chard, for the defendant.

One of the church-wardens and the ringers of Charlton, Somerset, having denied the right of the Rector, the Rev. Mr. Sharpe, to controul the ringing of the church bells, the latter consulted Dr. Lushington on the subject; and the following (extracted from the Bath Chronicle of the 4th January, 1821) is the substance of the Doctor's opinion on the question put to him by the Rector.

“That the consent of the minister (whether incumbent or curate) is necessary to authorize the ringing of bells in the church, and that the consent of either or both church-wardens, without the minister's consent, is not sufficient. That the minister's consent to the ringing of the bells, must always be had: if the two church-wardens differ, the consent of the minister and one church-warden is sufficient; but the consent of the minister against both church-wardens would not justify the ringing, nor would the consent of both church-wardens against the minister authorize it. That the minister has authority to limit the time of ringing, and that the ringers are bound to obey him. And that no person has a right without the consent of the minister, (whether incumbent or curate) to place flags, garlands, or any thing else, either in or upon the church, or in the church-yard.”

ECCLESIASTICAL PREFERMENTS.

The most reverend Lord JOHN GEORGE BERESFORD, Archbishop of Dublin, is advanced to the Primacy.

The right rev. WILLIAM MAGEE, Bishop of Raphoe, to the Archbishopric of Dublin.

The right rev. NATHANIEL ALEXANDER, Bishop of Down and Connor, becomes Archbishop of Cashel.

The rev. WILLIAM BISSSETT, Archdeacon of Ross, is to be Bishop of Down and Connor.

Crespigny, H. Champion de, to the vicarage of Neatishead, Norfolk.

Dethick, Thomas, M.A. perpetual curate of Mary's, Bridgnorth, to the living of Oldbury, Salop; patron, THE LORD CHANCELLOR.

Edwards, Thomas Wynne, of Jesus college, Oxford, to the perpetual curacies of Llanrhôs and Llangystennin; patron, THE LORD BISHOP OF ST ASAPH.

Gaskin, George, D.D., of Trinity college,

Oxford, has been collated, by the Lord Bishop of Ely, to a prebend or canonry in the Cathedral Church of Ely, on the nomination of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Hill, Thomas, to the vicarage of Chesterfield, Derbyshire.

Jackson, Thomas, to the vicarage of East Coton, Yorkshire.

Lee, Mr. M.A. of Queen's college, Cambridge, to be chaplain of Cambridge Gaol.

Leggett, John, to the rectory of East Tisted, Hants; patron, JAMES SCOTT, Esq. of Rotherfield park.

Palmer, George, M.A. fellow of Jesus college, Cambridge, to the rectory of Harlston, Cambridgeshire; patrons, THE MASTER AND FELLOWS of that Society.

Powell, Howell W. to the rectory of Heapham, near Gainsborough; patron, SIR WILLIAM AINCOTT INGILBY, BART. of Ripley Castle.

Simons, N. rector of *St. Margaret's Canterbury*, to the rectory of *Ickham*; patron, **THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY**.

Thomas, John, M.A. of *Trinity college, Cambridge*, and chaplain to his Royal Highness the *Duke of Sussex*, to the vicarage of *Great Burstead, Essex*; patron, the **REV. EDWARD EVANS**, of *Erismwell, Suffolk*.

Tunney, R. W. late of *Ipswich*, from the half-pay, to be chaplain to the **Forces**.

Uppjohn, William, to the vicarage of *Bynham, Norfolk*; patron, **T. T. CLARKE**, Esq. of *Swakeley, Middlesex*.

Whaley, J. G. M.A. fellow and tutor of *St. Peter's college, Cambridge*, to the rectory of *Witnesham, Suffolk*; patrons, **THE MASTER AND FELLOWS** of that Society.

Whitlock, W. Spencer, chaplain to the *Military Asylum, Southampton*, to the living of *Gedney, Lincolnshire*.

Whitfield, W. H. B.D. fellow of *St. John's college, Cambridge*, to the rectory of *Lawford, Essex*; patrons, **THE MASTER AND FELLOWS** of that Society.

Vaur, William, M.A. late fellow of *Baliol college, Oxford*, to be chaplain to his Grace the *Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, in the room of the *rev. Charles Lloyd, D.D.* regius professor of divinity.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

Degrees conferred May 2.

DOCTOR IN CIVIL LAW.—The venerable *Charles Daubeny*.

MASTERS OF ARTS.—*Frederic Gambier, fellow of All Souls college*; *William Charlton, Magdalen hall*; *George More Molyneux, Trinity college*; *Richard Goff, Christ Church*.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.—*John Dickin-son, Trinity college*, grand compounder; *Elbro' Woodcock, Oriel college*, grand compounder; *Thomas Wotton Barlow, Wadham college*; *Henry A. S. Atwood, Queen's college*; *Robert John Hatchman, St. Edmund hall*; *Charles Henry Thomas Baumgarten, Magdalen hall*; *Nicholas Toke, Trinity college*; *George Woodcock, Trinity college*; *Charles Stephen Hassels, Trinity college*; *Brook William Bridges, Oriel college*; *Thomas Pryce Lloyd, Christ church*; *Charles Pitt, Christ church*; *William Ives, Baliol college*; *William Hest Everard, Baliol college*; *John Alington, demy of Magdalen college*; *John Birch Webb, Brasenose college*; *Francis Jackson Blandy, fellow of St. John's college*.

May 9.

MASTERS OF ARTS.—*John D'Arcy Preston, Merton college*; *Richard Derby Ness, Lincoln college*; *George Musgrave Musgrave, Brasenose college*; *Wal-*

ter Haynes Bury, fellow of St. John's college.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.—*John Manuel Echalaz, scholar of Trinity college*; *Edward Denison, Oriel college*; *Samuel Richard Bosanquet, Christ church*; *Luke Fowler, Christ church*; *John Campbell, Baliol college*; *William Fowle, University college*; *James Davis, scholar of University college*; *William Buller, scholar of Worcester college*.

May 15.

MASTERS OF ARTS.—*Thomas Marker, Exeter college*; *Robert Gordon, fellow of New college*; *James Acland Templar, Merton college*.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.—*Hon. Charles Finch, Merton college*, grand compounder; *William S. Gillett, Exeter college*; *Gilbert Gilbert, Wadham college*; *Haynes Gibbs, exhibitioner of Lincoln college*; *George Alexander Hamilton, Trinity college*; *Samuel Jay, Oriel college*; *Chas. J. Fynes Clinton, Oriel college*; *Wyndham Jeane Godden, Oriel college*; *Chas. Ross, Christ Church*; *Thomas Sweet Escott, Baliol college*; *Rees Howell, scholar of Jesus college*; *Owen Jenkins, scholar of Jesus college*; *John Hawley, St. John's college*; *Joseph Duncan Ostrehan, Worcester college*; *Richard Greswell, scholar of Worcester college*.

The *Petræan Fellowship* now vacant at *Exeter college*, is open to natives of the following counties, viz.—*Oxford, Devon, Somerset, Dorset, Essex, Norfolk, and Suffolk*. The election will take place on the 30th of June. Candidates are required to produce certificates of their birth on or before the 15th of June, and must have been created senior sophists, according to the forms prescribed by the university statutes.

May 8.—*Messrs. Thompson, Birtwhistle, H. R. Harrison, and Brackenbury*, were elected *scholars of Lincoln college*; and *Messrs. Ness and Latimer, exhibitioners on Lord Crewe's foundation*.

Mr. Leach, Mr. James, and Mr. Titley, of Jesus college, have been elected *scholars of that Society*.

May 9.—*Mr. Charles Palairret and Mr. Henry James Buckoll*, were elected *exhibitioners of Queen's college*, on the *Michel foundation*.

May 14.—The following gentlemen of *Westminster school* were elected *students of Christ Church*:—*Mr. William Smythe, Mr. Nassau Hume Dodgson, Mr. Richard Newcombe Gresley, Mr. J. Ley, and Mr. Thomas Partington*.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

Degrees conferred May 4.

MASTER OF ARTS.—*Charles Porter, Caius college*.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.—*W. Russell, Caius college*; *E. Jenkins, Trinity college*; *F. R. Crowder, Trinity college*

May 8.

BACHELOR IN PHYSIC.—C. J. R. Allatt, *Trinity College*.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.—B. Bowles, *Jesus college*; P. Hewett, *St. John's college*; N. Walters, *Trinity college*.

May 15.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.—L. Buller, and J. C. Evans of *King's college*.

May 22.

MASTERS OF ARTS.—J. J. Pemberton, *Trinity college*; W. Bradney, *Trinity college*; W. Brougham, *Jesus college*.

BACHELOR OF ARTS.—S. G. Fairtlough, *Christ college*.

April 28.—Mr. C. H. Maturin, of *King's college* was admitted fellow of that society.

May 15.—At a congregation this day a grace passed the senate to continue the *Professorship of Mineralogy* held by the late rev. Dr. E. D. Clarke.

On the same day J. Watson, Esq. *M.A. Fellow of St. John's college*, was admitted *Licentiate in Physic*.

May 16.—A. Allivant, esq. *B.A. of Trinity college*, was elected Hebrew Scholar on Mr. Tyrwhitt's foundation.

ORDINATIONS.

April 28.

The Lord Bishop of Bristol, in the Chapel of Christ College, ordained the following gentlemen.

PRIESTS.—Edward J. Ash, *B.A. Christ college, Cambridge*; J. Cantis, *B.A. Christ college, Cambridge*; H. R. Fowler, *B.A. Exeter college, Oxford*; R. Jeffreys, *M.A. St. John's college, Cambridge*; with Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Ely, J. B. Atkinson, *B.A. Sydney college, Cambridge*; with Let. Dim. from Bishop of Chester. G. E. W. Morris, with Let. Dim. from Bishop of Nova Scotia.

DEACONS.—Thomas Baker, *B.A. Christ college, Cambridge*, G. Stone, *B.A. Sidney college, Cambridge*, with Let. Dim. from Bishop of Chichester.

W. Clarke, *B.A. Magdalen hall, Oxford*; E. R. Mantell, *B.A. Emanuel college, Cambridge*; with Let. Dim. from Bishop of Sarum.

Newton Smart, *B.A. University college, Oxford*, with Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Durham.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

BEDFORDSHIRE.

Married.—The rev. Edward Orlebar Smith, *rector of Holeset and Salford*, to Julia, daughter of the late rev. Thomas Willis, of *Bletchley, Bucks*, and sister of John Fleming, esq. *M.P. for Hampshire*.

BERKS.

Married.—The rev. T. Upwood, only son of Thomas Upwood, esq. of *Terrington St. Clement, Norfolk*, to Jane, fifth

daughter of William Stevens, esq. of *Pedworth*.

Married.—The rev. Edward Burges, of *South Moreton*, to Ann, daughter of Mr. G. R. Ward, of *Bruton, Somerset*.

Married.—At *Clewer*, the rev. C. F. Watkins, *curate of New Windsor*, to Miss Hoffelman, of that place.

BUCKS.

Married.—The rev. Charles Drage, of *Downham, Cambridgeshire*, to Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the rev. Z. Brooke, *Monks Risborough*.

CAMBRIDGE.

Married.—The rev. J. Standly, *M.A. Fellow of Caius college, Cambridge*, to Caroline Frances, third daughter of W. O. Brigstocke, esq. of *Blaenpont, Cardigan-shire*.

CHESTER.

Married.—The rev. Richard Henry Gretton, *M.A. rector of Nantwich*, and second son of the late *Dean of Hereford*, to Frances, fifth daughter of the late John Bennion, esq. of *Charlton*.

CUMBERLAND.

Died.—At *Belle Isle, near Kerbleside*, on his way to *Cheltenham*, the rev. William Curwen, of *Harrington*, second son of J. C. Curwen, esq. *M.P.*

DEVON.

Married.—By the rev. G. Ware, *B.A. the rev. Stephen Middleton, of Trinity college, Cambridge*, to Mary, only daughter of John Ware, esq. of *Tiverton*.

Married.—At *Halberton*, the rev. J. Eagles, *M.A. of Wadham College*, to Elizabeth, second daughter of the late Henry Manley, esq. of *Manley, near Tiverton*.

DORSETSHIRE.

Married.—The rev. W. A. Trim, *M.A. of Yetminster*, to Mrs. Bullock, widow of the late George Bullock, esq. of *East Coker, Somerset*.

DURHAM.

Married.—The rev. James Blackburn, late *Fellow of Trinity college, Cambridge*, vicar of *Gainford, Durham*, and rector of *Romaldkirk, Yorkshire*, to Jane, widow of the Martin Dunn, esq.

ESSEX.

Died.—Late at his house in *Barking*, the rev. Charles Wakeham, *A.M. formerly of Christ college, Cambridge, rector of Wickemby, and a prebendary of Lichfield and Coventry*; eldest son of the rev. Nicholas Wakeham, *D.D. late rector and dean of Bocking*.

Remarkable in early days and in his maturer years, for native goodness of heart and sincerity of manners; a cheerful friend, a kind master, and a liberal contributor to the comforts of polished society, and to the welfare of the poor.

The desponding tears of his amiable

and widowed consort; the keen sorrows of his relatives; the grief of his numerous friends, and of the clergy who attended at his interment, deeply and conspicuously attested their love and their regret.

In the discharge of his professional duties, the earnest manner of his prayer, and the sound doctrine of his discourses evinced an unaffected and steady piety, eclipsing all glare and ostentation.

With a deep humility of mind and an unshaken trust in the Redemption by the blood of Jesus, he departed in the true faith of the blessed Trinity, leaving to his survivors a strong ground of consolation and hope that he is now numbered among those over whom the second death hath no power, and who now live gloriously among the holy angels in the peaceful mansions of our heavenly Father.

Upon the coffin, on a plain shield of brass, was an inscription of which the following is a copy.

A.

Ω.

H. S. E

Defensus admodum et laudandus,

REV. CAROLUS WAKEHAM, A.M.

Natus } Anno }

Renatus } Salutis } MDCCCLX.

Denatus Kal: Apr: XIII.

MDCCXXII.



RESURGET.

During many years he performed the duty of Shatford vicarage; as curate, for a small salary, which he annually distributed to the poor; and when upon a vacancy, the living, worth about 200*l.* per annum, was offered to his acceptance, he declined in favour of a worthy clergyman who was then unbefriced, and on whom it was liberally bestowed by the present exemplary patron—a Prebendary of Wells.

Died. — At *Dedham*, in the 24th year of his age, the rev. John Jowett Stevens, B.A. second master of the Royal Grammar School, Norwich, and sixth son of the late rev. Dr. Stevens, of *Panfield, Essex.*

GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

Married.—The rev. Thomas Hill, of *Haydon lodge*, near *Cheltenham*, rector of *Badgeworth*, Gloucestershire, to Miss *Hulls*, daughter of Mr. *Hulls*, of *Corse*, near *Gloucester.*

Died.—The rev. Payler Matthew Proctor, vicar of *Newland*, and incumbent of *Christchurch*, in the Forest of *Dean.*

HANTS.

Married.—The rev. William Norris, eldest son of the rev. William Norris, rector of *Warblington*, to Anne Frances, eldest daughter of John Butler, esq. of *Warblington*, and *Bramshot.*

Married.—The rev. Henry Quartley, to Dinah, daughter of Arthur Quartley, esq. of *Christchurch.*

ISLE OF WIGHT.

Died.—At the parsonage, *Northwood*, the rev. Thomas Dalton, B.D. vicar of *Carisbrooke.* The living is in the gift of the provost and fellows of *Queen's college, Oxford.*

KENT.

Married.—The rev. Thomas Harrison, of *Denne Hill*, near *Canterbury*, to *Jemima Elizabeth*, only daughter of the late *Champion Branfell*, esq. of *Upminster Hall, Essex.*

LEICESTERSHIRE.

Died. — At *Coston*, near *Buckminster*, in the 73d year of his age, the rev. William Hervey, rector of that place, and nephew to the rev. James Hervey, author of the "*Meditations*," &c.

LINCOLNSHIRE.

Married.—The rev. T. Welby Northmore, to Catherine, third daughter of sir W. E. Welby, bart. of *Denton Hall.*

MIDDLESEX.

Married — At *St. George's, Hanover-square, London*, the rev. J. Edwin Lance, to *Madelina Louisa*, the only surviving daughter of the late *Dupré Porcher*, esq. of *Winslade, Devon.*

Died.—In *Hill-street, Berkeley-square*, in his 68th year, the hon. and most rev. William Stuart, archbishop of *Armagh*, and Lord Primate of all *Ireland.* His grace was the fifth and youngest, and last surviving son of John, earl of *Bute.* He was translated from the see of *St. David's*, to the primacy of *Ireland*, in December, 1800.

NORFOLK.

Died.—The rev. Edward P. Edwards, curate of *Holme next the sea.*

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE.

Married.—The rev. Edward Barton Lye, M.A. vicar of *Raunds*, in *Northamptonshire*, to Sophia, daughter of the late J. Whitaker, esq. of *Bratton, Wilts.*

Married.—The rev. Stephen Middleton, of *Irchester*, to Miss Ware.

Died.—The rev. Edward Hunt, rector of *Benefield*, and of *Stoke.*

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE.

Married.—The rev. T. F. Beckwith, vicar of *East Retford*, to Miss Carter, only daughter of the rev. J. Carter, of *Lincoln.*

OXFORDSHIRE.

Married.—At *St. Peter's-in-the-East church*, by the rev. the principal of *Brasenose college*, the rev. John Page, B.D. senior fellow of that society, and vicar of *Gillingham, Kent*, to Mary, second daughter of the late William Yalden, esq. of *Lovington, Hants.*

Died.—After a short but severe illness, the rev. James Hamer, B.D. fellow of

Corpus Christi college, and senior bursar and librarian of that society.

SOMERSETSHIRE.

Married.—The rev. William Gordon, rector of *Spaxton*, to Diana, daughter of the late John Harris, esq. of *Radford, Devonshire*.

Died.—In *Pulteney-street, Bath*, aged 73, the rev. William Haverfield.

Died.—Aged 63, the rev. Richard Abraham, 30 years vicar of *Ilminster*, and rector of *Chaffcomb*.

SURREY.

Married.—The rev. P. Penson, precentor of the cathedral, and vicar of *St. Oswald's, Durham*, to Louisa Elizabeth, daughter of the late Mr. John Barley, of *Barnes, Surrey*.

WESTMORELAND.

Died.—At *Appleby*, in the county of *Westmoreland*, the rev. John Waller, M.A. head master of the free grammar school of that place, and rector of *Sulhamstead, Berks*. The living is in the gift of the provost and fellows of *Queen's college*.

WILTSHIRE.

Married.—The hon. and rev. Francis James Noel, fifth son of sir Gerard Noel Noel, bart., and the baroness Barham, to Cecilia Penelope, fifth daughter of the late Paul Cobb Methuen, esq. of *Corsham House, Wilts*.

YORKSHIRE.

Married.—The rev. C. E. Hutchinson, vicar of *Seaford, Sussex*, to Margaret, eldest daughter of the rev. George Marwood, of *Busby Hall, Yorkshire*.

Married.—At *Burnshall, in Yorkshire*, by the rev. Edward Coulthurst, the rev. Josias Robinson, M.A. and fellow of *Brasenose college*, to Margaret, only

child of the late ——— Atkinson, esq. of *Linton*, in the same county.

Married.—At *Doncaster*, the rev. T. F. Beckwith, vicar of *East Retford, Notts*, to Miss Carter, only daughter of the rev. J. Carter, of *Lincoln*.

Died.—The rev. R. Knowles, vicar of *Gisburn, in Craven, Yorkshire*.

Died.—At the rectory house, *Emley, near Wakefield*, aged 31, the rev. George Hewett, B.A. curate of that parish.

WALES.

Married.—The rev. Daniel James, M.A. perpetual curate of *St. Martin's chapel, near Caerphilly*, to Ann, eldest daughter of Mr. John Oatridge, of *St. Fagan's*.

Married.—At *Landugwidd, Cardigan*, the rev. J. Standly, M.A. to Miss C. Frances.

IRELAND.

Died.—At his house, in *Ratland-square, Dublin*, his grace the archbishop of *Cashel*.

Married.—The rev. J. C. Morgan, nephew to the lord bishop of *Cloyne*, and vicar of *Drishane*, to Elizabeth, third daughter of the late John Wallis, esq. of *Westwood, in the county of Cork*.

Married.—At *Raphoe*, the rev. Hugh McNeill, chaplain to the lord lieutenant of *Ireland*, rector of *Albury, in Surrey*, and son of Alexander McNeill, esq. of *Ballycastle*, to Anne Magee, daughter of the lord bishop of *Raphoe*.

ROME.

Died.—At *Rome*, the rev. Stephen George Ram, rector of *Ringmore, Devon*, and second son of the late Stephen Ram, esq. of *Ramsfort Gorey, Ireland*, and of *Portwood Lodge, Hants*.

MONTHLY LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

Remarks on the Universal Education of the Lower Classes, and on the Principles of Mr. Brougham's Plan, as affecting the Established Church; in a Sermon preached at *St. Lawrence's Church, Reading, Berks*, Jan. 8, 1822. By the Rev. E. A. Howman, M.A. Prebendary of *Salisbury*. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Proofs of Inspiration; or, the Grounds of Distinction between the New Testament and the Apocryphal Volume, occasioned by the recent Publication of the Apocryphal New Testament by Hone. By the Rev. Thomas Rennell, B.D. F.R.S. 6s.

Lectures on the Gospel according to *St. John*, Part the Second, delivered at the Parish Church, and at *St. Margaret's Chapel, in the Parish of Walcot, Bath*, on the Wednesdays and Fridays during Lent, in the Year 1822; with Notes. By

Charles Abel Moysey, D.D. Archdeacon of *Bath*, and Rector of *Walcot*. 8vo. 6s.

Discourses, chiefly Doctrinal, delivered in the Chapel of *Trinity College, Dublin*. By Bartholomew Lloyd, D.D. S.F.T.C.D. M.R.I.A. Professor of Mathematics in the University, and Chaplain to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of *Ireland*. 10s. 6d.

A Defence of the Clergy of the Church of England, stating their Services, their Rights, and their Resources, from the earliest Ages to the present Time, and shewing the Relation in which they stand to the Community and to the Agriculturist. By the Rev. Francis Thackeray. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

A Refutation of Mr. Grimshawe's Pamphlet, entitled "The Wrongs of the Clergy of the Diocese of *Peterborough* stated and illustrated," in which is given

a correct Account of the Causes which have called forth the violent and abusive Pamphlets against the Bishop of Peterborough," &c. &c. 8vo. 1s.

A Sermon preached at the opening of the New Organ in the Parish Church of St. Nicholas, in the City of Bristol. By the Rev. J. Eden, B.D. late of St. Alban Hall, Oxford. With Notes illustrative of the subject Matter of the Discourse, and designed particularly to encourage Parochial Psalmody, and to suggest effectual Means of forming a Congregation to this edifying part of Divine Service. 4to. 3s.

A Charge delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Archdeaconry of Colchester, in the Diocese of London, in the Year 1821. By the Rev. J. Jefferson, A.M. and F.A.S. late Archdeacon. 8vo. 2s.

The Doctrine of the Gospel and the Order of its Preaching, deduced from Scripture History, in Discourses on the Apostolical Commission. By the Rev. J. G. Tolley. 8vo. 6s.

Supplement to the Rev. J. R. Pitman's Lectures on the Gospel of St. John. 8vo. 4s.

A Vindication of the Paradise Lost from the Charge of Exculpating "Cain, a Mystery." By Philo-Milton. 8vo. 2s.

The Kingdom of Christ not of this World, a Sermon preached at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul's, on the Anniversary of the Sons of the Clergy, May 17, 1821. By the Rev. T. Rennell, B.D. F.R.S. Vicar of Kensington. 4to. 1s. 6d.

Eighteen Sermons, intended to establish the inseparable Connection between the Doctrines and the Practice of Christianity. 12mo. 5s.

An Apology for the Pastoral System of the Clergy; a Sermon preached at the Visitation of the Venerable the Archdeacon of Huntingdon, May 6, 1821, and published by his Command. By J. H. B. Mountain, M.A. Rector of Puttenham, and Vicar of Hemel Hempstead, Herts, and Prebendary of Lincoln. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

The High calling of the Gospel, in Twelve Sermons. By the late Rev. F. Thruston, M.A. 8vo. 8s.

A Vindication of the Supreme Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, so far as that Doctrine is impugned, in a "Critical Examination of a remarkable Prediction contained in Isaiah ix. 6, being a Sermon delivered on Christmas Day, 1821, at the Upper Meeting House, Newbury, by John Kitkat." By the Rev. S. Slocock, Rector of Wasing, Afternoon Preacher in the Parish of Newbury, and Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. the Earl of Carnarvon. 8vo. 3s.

An Account of a Plan which has been successfully pursued for three Years, in the conducting of a Penny Savings Bank for Children, with the addition of a Working Fund for Females; including Directions and Patterns for cutting out every sort of wearing Apparel for Girls, Shirts and Pinafores for Boys, and Linen usually lent to the Poor; together with the Price allowed for making each Article. 4to. 5s.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

WORKS IN THE PRESS.

The Rev. Dr. Rudge proposes to publish (by Subscription) Lectures on Genesis, or Plain Historical Sermons on the Leading Characters, and most Important Events, recorded in the Book of Genesis. In 2 Vols. 8vo.

An Attempt to illustrate the Book of Ecclesiastes, by the Rev. George Holden, A.M. Author of a "New Translation of the Proverbs of Solomon," and of "The Scripture Testimonies to the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, collected and illustrated," will be published by Subscription. It will consist of a Preliminary

Dissertation, a Paraphrase and Notes, and will form One Volume, 8vo.

The Eighth Edition of "Female Scripture Characters," by the late Mrs. F. E. King, will soon appear. A brief Memoir of the Author will be prefixed.

Mr. Dunlop, Author of "The History of Fiction," has a new Work in the Press, entitled, The History of Roman Literature, from the Earliest Periods to the Augustan Age. In 2 Vols. 8vo.

The River Derwent, and other Poems, by W. B. Clarke, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge, will appear next Month.

POLITICAL RETROSPECT.

THE Corn-laws have now been fully discussed in the House of Commons, and we are happy to observe,

that the debates have not produced that irritation in the public mind, which was excited some years back

by a similar cause. This is the best symptom which has been exhibited. As a remedy for the prevalent agricultural distress, or as the foundation for a permanent regulation of the Corn Trade, little has been accomplished. The country has heard the sentiments of its leading commercial and landed orators without being convinced by their arguments, or even enlightened by their explanations. The only opinion in which all agree is, that the existing law must be altered, and the alteration may be looked upon as a mere matter of compromise between the landholders and the rest of the community. We are disposed to think much better of the commercial regulations which have been introduced by Mr. Robinson and Mr. Wallace. They are in every instance approximations to that system of free trade which is so preferable to the restrictions of an earlier period of the world. At the same time, it would obviously be foolish, mischievous, and unjust, to pass at once from one extreme to the other. Property has been invested upon the faith of existing regulations, and an opportunity of withdrawing it ought to be afforded before a new order of things is adopted. The parties affected by the alteration are naturally hostile to it; and the theorists and the opposition condemn it as insufficient. But, on the whole, there is good

reason to believe that the measure will be useful, and will be carried into effect with very little inconvenience.

The plan for diminishing the immediate burden of the half-pay and pension lists is popular because it enables Parliament to remit taxes to the amount of two millions. It is not precisely the same thing as an encroachment upon the Sinking-fund. At the end of the term for which the annuities are to last, the funded debt will be no greater than it would have been if things had continued in their present state. Had the money been taken at once from the Sinking-fund, the funded debt would have been increased, or would rather have failed to be diminished by the whole sum so taken. The difference is, that according to the plan of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the country pledges itself to collect 2,500,000*l.* a year for forty-five years; and the pensions are to be paid out of this annuity. Were the annuity added to the Sinking-fund, this would amount precisely to the same thing as the plan now proposed. During the first half of the term to which the operations extend, the effect will be nearly the same as that of borrowing from the Sinking-fund, but during the latter half all the money to be borrowed will be repaid, which would not have been the case had the other plan been adopted.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

W. H. O.; *Laicus*; and *C. P.*; have been received, and are under consideration.

We have received several communications respecting a recent decision at the Norfolk Quarter Sessions, upon an appeal against an Assessment of Tithe to the Poor Rate. Our Correspondents do not seem to be aware of the grounds of that decision.—The Appellant rested his cause upon an assumption of his own, concerning the proportion which ought to exist between the Assessment upon the tithe-holder, and the land-holder. This proportion has never been fixed by law. The arbitrary arrangement of it could not be recognised; and the Court was compelled to dismiss the Appeal without entering into the real merits of the case.

The article enquired after by *P.* shall appear.

I

1. I

ment
Notes

2. I

could
On the
and on
blishing
Part V

B

3. I

RECE
scripts
the va

The
Autho

A N

chief
poluti
tions a
serve

The T

H

School

Lond
and
M. G

WE.

ure
fied
ve-

im-
and
e it
s to
it is
an

ng-
for
the
man
and
ate,
nce
ded

or
di-
ken.
g to
the
it-
ear
pen-

an-
to
unt
the
the
will

por-
but
ney
aid,
case

.

nder

sion
nent
ware
an
exist
This
of
the

1.

me
No

2
con
On
and
blis
Par

3
RE
scri
the

T
Aut

A
chie
poi
tion
serv

The

H
Scho

Lon
an
M.

In Six very large Volumes, octavo, Price in Boards, 3l. 12s.

Dedicated, by Permission, to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury :
The Second Edition of

1. **ECCLESIASTICAL BIOGRAPHY** ; or Lives of Eminent Men connected with the History of Religion in England, from the Commencement of the Reformation, to the Revolution: Selected and Illustrated with Notes.

By **CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D.**

Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.

2. **THE CHURCHMAN ARMED** against the **ERRORS** of the **TIMES** : containing Extracts from various Authors, arranged under Five Heads. Part I. On the Constitution of the Church of Christ, on the Ministerial Commission, and on the Unity to be preserved in the Church. Part II. Ecclesiastical Establishments and Tests. Part III. Church of England. Part IV. Popery. Part V. Toleration. In three volumes, 8vo. price 1l. 5s. 6d. in boards.

By "The Society for the Distribution of Tracts in Defence of the United Church of England and Ireland, as by Law established."

3. **AN INQUIRY** into the **INTEGRITY** of the **GREEK VULGATE** or **RECEIVED TEXT** of the **NEW TESTAMENT** ; in which the Greek Manuscripts are newly classed, the Integrity of the Authorized Text Viadicated, and the various Readings traced to their Origin.

By the Rev. **FREDERICK NOLAN**,
A Presbyter of the United Church.

Handsomely printed in one Volume, octavo, price in boards, 16s.

Also by the same Author,

The **OPERATIONS** of the **HOLY GHOST**, illustrated and confirmed by Scriptural Authorities ; in a Series of Sermons, with Notes and Illustrations. 8vo. 12s.

* * For a Character of this Work see the British Critic for July, 1814.

In Four large Volumes, octavo, price 2l. 8s. boards,

AN ESSAY on the **PROPER LESSONS** appointed by the **LITURGY** of the **CHURCH** of **ENGLAND** to be read on **SUNDAYS** and chief **FESTIVALS** throughout the **YEAR**. To which are prefixed, Prefaces, pointing out the Design of the respective Lessons, together with such Reflections and explanatory Notes on the several Passages contained therein, as may serve to enforce the Duties and Doctrines propounded to our Faith and Practice.

By **WILLIAM WOGAN, Esq.**
Late of Ealing, in Middlesex.

The Third Edition, with a Life of the Author, by the Rev. **JAMES GATLIFF**.

London : Printed for Ogle, Duncan, and Co.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

Just published, by Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy, price 3s. 6d.

HINTS for **CONDUCTING SUNDAY SCHOOLS**, useful also for Day Schools and Families. Compiled by the Committee of the Sunday School Society for Ireland. Third Edition.

* * For an account of this valuable Tract, see the British Review, No 35, for September, 1821.

London : Published by Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy ; sold also by Hatchard and Son ; and L. B. Seeley : and at Glasgow, by Chalmers and Collins ; and M. Ogle.

NEW EDITION of BISHOP MANT'S FAMILY COMMON PRAYER
BOOK.

This day is published, (dedicated, by Permission, to the Most Rev. the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury,) Part I. price 4s. on Medium, and 8s. on Royal Paper, of

1. **THE BOOK of COMMON PRAYER**, with Notes Explanatory, Practical, and Historical, from approved Writers of the Church of England, selected and arranged

By the Right Rev. RICHARD MANT, D.D.
Lord Bishop of Killaloe.

Oxford: Printed for J. Parker; and F. C. and J. Rivington, 62, St. Paul's Church-yard, and 3, Waterloo-Place, Pall-Mall, London: and sold by all Booksellers in Town and Country.

Of the Booksellers above mentioned may be had,

2. A CONCORDANCE to the HOLY BIBLE; to which is added a Geographical Index, with the Calendar and table of Lessons; designed to accompany any Quarto Edition of the Bible, and adapted to the Maps and Notes of the Family Bible, published under the Direction of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Edited by JAMES W. BELLAMY, M.A. Rector of the united Parishes of St. Mary, Abchurch, and St. Laurence, Pountney, and Prebendary of St. Paul's. Neatly printed in quarto, on Medium Paper, price 4s. and on fine Royal Paper, 7s. also in one Volume octavo, on Royal Paper, price in boards, 8s.

3. A HELP to the UNLEARNED in the Study of the Holy Scriptures, being an Attempt to explain the Bible in a familiar Way. Adapted to common Apprehensions, and according to the Opinions of approved Commentators. By Mrs. TAMMER, Author of Sacred History; selected from the Scriptures, with Annotations and Reflections, and other Works. The fourth Edition. 2 Vols. 12mo. 2s. in boards.

4. CONTEMPLATIONS on the Historical Passages of the OLD and NEW TESTAMENT. By the Right Rev. Father in God, JOSEPH HALL, late Lord Bishop of Norwich. Four Vols. 12mo. 11. 4s.

5. PLAIN REMARKS on the FOUR GOSPELS, for the Benefit of uninstructed Persons, and adapted to the use of Schools and Families. By the Rev. J. SLADE, M.A. Vicar of Bolton and Prebendary of Chester. Second Edition. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

6. The ARGUMENTS of the Books and Chapters of the OLD and NEW TESTAMENT, with practical Observations. Written originally in French, by the Rev. Mr. OSTERVOLD, Professor of Divinity, and one of the Ministers of the Church at Neufchatel in Switzerland, and by him presented to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Translated by J. CHAMBERLAYNE, Esq. Three Volumes, 12mo. Eighth Edition, revised and corrected. 10s. 6d.

7. An HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY of the OLD and NEW TESTAMENT. By EDWARD WELLS, D.D. Rector of Cotesbach, in Leicestershire. Two Vols. 12mo. with 17 Maps and Plates, 12s.

8. An HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY of the NEW TESTAMENT only. By the same Author. 12mo. 3s. 6d. bound.